

# METHODIST

## QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

APRIL, 1868.

---

### ART. I.—THE DIVINE ELEMENT IN INSPIRATION.

[ARTICLE THIRD.]

The doctrine of Verbal Inspiration is yet further confirmed if we consider the great law of expression called Style. Not only is every word an original creation, spiritual as well as material, but there are laws under which words arrange themselves, like elemental life in the varied types of flower, fruit, beast, and man, which laws are themselves almost solely, certainly supremely, spiritual, and which compel these individual creations to assume as equally vital and divine combinations :

"For in the word his life is and his breath,  
And in the word his death." \*

Style is the fashion of the mind, and inseparable from it. Shakspeare's, Milton's, and Dante's—every great writer's style—is one with himself. It is himself in his happiest mood. It is the beautiful expression which lights up, with the soul itself, the less beautiful countenance. Take away that soul from those beaming eyes, and naught remains but fish-like films. Take away this outer expression from the soul, and it beats wildly in its dungeon of flesh, with no more power to make its condition known than had Jugurtha in his Mamertine cell, with only thick-ribbed walls around him.

So it is with Style. It is the soul of thought revealing itself

\* Atalanta in Calydon.

in language. Whether the expression of the face be ugly or attractive depends on the spirit within. The homeliest cast of features often become inconceivably lovely if the nature is all beautiful within, and the handsomest countenance can be, and not unfrequently in fallen natures is, unutterably abhorrent, from the soul that leers through its every feature.

The quality of Style inheres feebly in some minds, and is apt to exist in the lowest degree in those which are critical rather than creative. The grammarian may cover pages with his sharp dissections of Shakspearan blunders, and never a sentence reveal his own power to frame a vital phrase. The construction may be grammatical, and yet the expression lifeless, as a row of bricks may be symmetrical yet not artistic. This order of minds is often engaged in the study of this theme. They "get up" commentaries, and reviews, and examinations; "gotten up," not *growing up* from the rich soil of their own being. Now and then a poet, that is, a maker, plants his soul in these dry places, and instantly the desert blossoms as a rose. Bengel, Quesnel, Henry, Whedon, Calvin, Augustine, Lange, stand almost alone among the unnumbered mass of commentators for their gift of expression; and every one of them has a style for his thought as inevitable and inseparable as soul and spirit.

But while the critical faculty is apt to be exceedingly dry and dead, it may be instinct with a lower, yet not valueless life. Its own nature demands straightforward simplicity and clearness of statement. If these be instinct with fresh and powerful conceptions of the theme, and its relations to cognate or remote questions; if the language used set forth their original and related nature in forcible terms, then this faculty compels attention and admiration. It brings forth fruit after its kind—rich fruit and rare—that all delight to taste, and that is to be desired to make one wise, though not particularly pleasant to the higher vision of imagination and melody. Such plain, strong critics as Clarke, Owen, Bentham, Mill, Spencer, Edwards, Humboldt, Agassiz—most scientific minds—command position by the power of the argument, affluence of their learning, or penetration of their thoughts; but they are less effective for popular or permanent effect than those of their own school who can unite with these gifts



of scholarship and sagacity the yet higher one of poetry or style. Hugh Miller surpasses his rivals not so much in scholarship as in expression. St. Beuve leads the critical school not in knowledge but in utterance. Pascal and Bacon rule the scientific world by the marvelous vitality of their words more than by the profounder insight of their thought. Augustine and Calvin subdue one half of Christendom to their peculiar and abhorrent dogmas by the rare beauty of their speech. Plato wins the palm from Aristotle, not alone from his having a better philosophy, but a greater genius for expression. Emerson makes slaves to his paganism, captured through the subtle beauty of his style. Addison swayed his age with this wand of Prospero. Shakspeare thus sways all ages.

Style has as many varieties in its unity as any other vital essence. It rises from the simplest form of speech to the most perfect poetry. In the child-speech and in the commonest employment of language there is a lurking life, as in the zoöphite and the most amorphous rock. The words of daily and cheapest use are full often of rare beauty. We may drop them carelessly from our lips, as we pass the current coin, forgetful of the beauty of its die and original aspect: yet the numismatist will find traces of highest art in that smooth and dingy penny, and the most ragged remnant of our currency, to a student of engraving, is full of the finest workmanship. At times these despised words put on a wonderful power and beauty. They change, like a plot of ground under an East Indian juggler, instantly from black barrenness to rarest blossoming.

They have a latent poetry in themselves which etymologists discover, and which show often the fullness with which they were filled at their creation. They were born, like Adam and Eve, in a perfection from which, like mankind, they have fallen. Thus beautiful is "adieu"—"to God"—a most devout benediction, and yet employed by the most undevout and frivolous of people. "Good-by"—"God be with you"—is the most fervent of prayers. So vital is almost all the language of daily speech.

Thus we see that in every word there is an instinct which makes it adaptable to these highest uses. It has a capacity for rhythm and rhyme. It has a soul of its own, which at certain

moments becomes visible to every eye. How full of poetry is "father," "mother," "husband," "wife," "home." So little a word as "my" becomes all-embracing when by it the skeptic Thomas lifts his soul from the depths of unbelief and once more clasps his Lord and his God. It is full of an unutterable intensity of life when it is added by the late-despairing Mary to her reverent recognition of her lost Redeemer. The Greek drops a single letter from her Hebrew, and despoils her language of its sweetest fullness. "Jesus said unto her, Mary." She, turning, and seeing his soul in his face, which he had previously intentionally hid from her, says unto him "Rabboni"—"My Master."\*

But this lowest strata of word-life, compared with its highest forms, is like the fossil module compared with the perfect man. It is only that we may show how potently this life pervades its humblest creatures that we refer to it. We find in the commonest words rare revelations of the power of this principle. As we ascend to more complicated language the same law still obtains. It compels every genus of thought to conform to its own law of being. The style of a controversialist, critic, narrator, scientist, orator, historian, essayist, novelist, and poet have all as marked differences under one common nature as have the different beasts of the field or classes of men. Nay, more, it ramifies itself into still wider and rarer forms, so that each of them may be largely subdivided. Take the last and highest and hence most varied form. How different the style of the dramatic and epic poet, the satirist and hymnist, the humorist and tragicist, the sonneteer and the lyrist. Wordsworth could not be Byron, nor Byron Wordsworth. Scott, as a balladist, was unsurpassed; as a lyrist, he is feeble as a ghost by the side of Campbell. Tennyson essays most effectively the idyl, or brief and pregnant story—he would fail utterly in the drama. Shakspeare, the most-sided of all, has rare lines in his "Lucrece" and "Venus," but had he written in no other form he would have been counted far behind his first English father, Chaucer. He lacks the perfect flow of that rare master of the poetic novel.

In this higher life a new law comes in. The word is not now a law unto itself. It becomes married to the law of the spirit that employs it for the expression of its own states, and hence

\* See Müller, First Series, p. 379, *et passim*.

is born what is more properly known as style, the peculiar nature of the author.

Here is the point of difficulty between supervisionists and ipsissimists. Let us therefore walk carefully. The former contend that this Style, or the law under which every great genius flows into written form, is overridden and practically annihilated by the doctrine that God is the author, verbally, of his own book. They also assert that these distinctions exist in as marked a degree in the Bible among its human authors as in any compilation made from the standard writers of any land; between those thus collected together. Since these differences exist, and since they arise from their human author, there is no such thing actually, as there cannot be abstractly, as Plenary Verbal Inspiration.

Considering this argument, we shall show that this style of a writer, which is essential to his individual being as a writer, *demand*s that God's Book shall be as equally his own as theirs is theirs; that the Bible is not a congregation of separate writers discoursing on a common theme, like the "Essays and Reviews," but one book, where a single though universal genius flows in all directions, according to recognized laws, into narrative, argument, song, and proverb; each perfect and each from one source; and that these human writers are not, judging from their very declarations as well as their own style elsewhere, in these utterances simply revealing the workings of their own nature, but are conceiving and bringing forth another nature, separate and higher than their own, though connected with it vitally and not mechanically, as is wrongly charged upon the verbalists: even as the Son of God was born of, but infinitely above, the Virgin Mary, because of her conceptual marriage with the Holy Ghost.

(1.) All original authors have a style of their own. It is as marked as their hand-writing, as limited as the banks of a stream or the shores of an ocean. No one can imitate Milton or Homer, Demosthenes or Dante, nor can they copy each other. From this fact, which all concede, we deduce again, in passing, our central thought—the inseparable unity of the thought and word. When Shakspeare conceives of Hamlet's soliloquy, it arises not an ideal ghost, but a form, having a verbal completeness in bone, flesh, and blood. So springs forth Milton's Hymn of Praise, so Dante's Ugolino, or Homer's

Plea of Andromache. These writers feel and confess this necessity. Thackeray declares he did not know in his best moods how he came to speak as he did, and would cry out after he had written such a sentence, "Splendid!" as if he were looking at another's art. Yet the whole structure was purely Thackerayan, his own, and he knew it was and could be no other's. Deep thinkers often detect and draw forth a hidden life in words. Carlyle, Shakspeare, Milton, Tennyson, abound in this original power. Dante said, "he had oft made words say in his rhymes what they were not wont to express for other poets." But all his words were Dantean in their new life and new combination.

Now this confessed and almost axiomatic law is not departed from in the word of God. It has a style of its own. From the first verse to the last there is a striking likeness. Whatever the especial topic, whoever the ostensible speaker, there is a unity pervading the style that is as marvelous as the unity that consolidates the thought. Are sin, sacrifice, and salvation found in the opening chapters? So are they in the closing, written not less than two, if less than four thousand years after. Creation is in both, and regeneration; the same Saviour promised, apparent, regnant. "So is the style the same. What identity of expression is there in the first verses of Genesis and John? They could have dropped from the same pen at the same instant of time.

Its varieties of literature have a like unaccountable uniformity. The story of Joseph, perhaps the most perfect narrative in the Bible, is precisely after the style of the story of Ruth; and both do not differ a hair's breadth from that of her last-described daughter, the Virgin mother. Luke's and Matthew's portrait of her is of the same school and by the same pencil that drew her beautiful parents, Ruth, Rachel, and Rebecca. This law holds in all lesser sketches. The hand of Raphael is seen as clearly in *La Fornarina* as in the *Transfiguration*; in the *Infant God* as in its worshipping mother. So the Bible style is seen as perfectly in its least as in its longest narratives. The stories of the queen of Sheba, or of the Judges, are in precisely the same calm, close, clear fashion as those which expand into the life of Abraham, Moses, Samuel, David, or those which crown the whole, the fourfold biography of their Lord

and ours. These are as completely one as are the galleries of portraits and historical paintings which come from a single easel—Lawrence or Reynolds, Van Dyck or Holborn, Murillo or Angelo.

This same law prevails in all its departments of literature. The odes of David and Asaph and Moses are more inseparable than those of Watts and Wesley. It is not easy to distinguish Solomon's proverbs from that of Agur, which stands among them. The same general air pervades the prophecies. They have diversities, but they have also a remarkable resemblance. We can pass from one to the other of the minor prophets without knowing it from the style. Job has been attributed by more than one critic to Moses and to Solomon. Passages in Isaiah and Micah are almost identical; so much so, that it is said they cannot be verbally inspired. As if God could not repeat the very phrases, if he chose, as he does always the same idea. Isaiah has been attributed to Solomon, and Ecclesiastes to Job. Moses had as large a share, in the judgment of some critics, in the composition of the Bible as in its history. This curious fact exists in the New Testament also. A remarkable oneness possesses that volume in its style. The Gospels are framed after one law. Discourse and narrative, anecdote and dogma, strangely blend together, as they do not in any other biography. So that many charge Matthew with interpolating John in his text, and Mark is very often and very wrongfully declared to be but a synopsis of Matthew. Plutarch's Lives are not so uniform, nor Scott's Tales of a Grandfather. These four lives of Christ, with all their differences, and these we have conceded, have thus a life of their own, separate and supreme.\*

So is it with the other books. Paul, Peter, and John, the chief writers of the latter half of the New Testament, have a wonderful symmetry of expression. It would be hard to say who wrote the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians. "The greatest of these is Love," sounds strangely like the first Letter

\* A cognate topic to this is admirably handled in Bernard's Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament. He shows not so much unity of style as unity and development of idea. It is correlate and confirmatory of our position, and proves the single authorship of the Word. It is a happy contrast to Curtis's "Human Element," and Liber Librorum, and shows how patient study reveals a hidden and vital harmony where shallow scholarship only sees a vanishing discord.

of John, and more than one sentence of Peter's. "Love is the fulfilling of the Law," and, "If we love one another, God dwelleth in us," are the same style as well as thought. This general likeness is over whole chapters. The discussions and exhortations of James and Peter and Jude and John are always of one tone, often of almost one phraseology.

Thus the Bible is a unit. It is *a* Bible as well as *the* Bible—one book no less than the *only* one. This symmetry and unity of the most persistent and pervasive sort bespeak one Author, not a superintendent but Writer; himself the sole Conceiver and substantially the sole Utterer of every separate work and every individual word. It is a collection of books, and yet a single book; the fruit of many pens, yet written by One alone. God is by the necessity of language and by its own evidence and assertion as verbally its author as Shakspeare is of his dramas, or Homer of the *Iliad*.\*

(2.) But this fact is not deducible from its composition alone. The writers of the Bible always declare its authorship divine; both in so many words and in the unconscious testimony which their own style exhibits when not engaged in this service, in contrast with that which they then employ.

They confess this in many places in so many words. In the Psalms David often speaks as if he were God himself: "I have

\* This position is confirmed by a fine chapter in *Liber Librorum*, with the faulty title, "Many Authors, but One Book." That shows the unity of ideas in the Bible. This carries its conception further, and claims a deeper unity in style, thought, and language. "Scripture," it says, "as we all know, is a collection of tracts, the work of above thirty authors, who utter what they have to say, not contemporaneously, but in succession, and along a vast line of time, say sixteen hundred years. Yet, in spite of this, we all feel it to be ONE BOOK." Elsewhere he calls it "*the marvelous unity*," and says, "its preparation, under divine direction, is in some sense or other, and in a very high sense too, a great fact." "The voice of one [part] is the voice of the other. The historic, the didactic, the predictive, and the miraculous, all in turn reappear, and, as a rule, under the same conditions." A greater marvel, if possible, than this "*marvelous unity*," it is, that he should go so far and go no further; nay, should return on his own steps and deny the truth and symmetry of some of these interblended parts. If he can reject one portion as inharmonious, another can another, and the whole dissolves and disappears. If one state could sustain its independence, every body saw that the Union was a rope of sand. Much more is it true in this infinitely closer and more vital unity. Search for the unseen symmetry, rather than discard the seeming incoherence. If Bach's fugues are harsh to untaught ears, train the ear, not reduce the mighty harmony. If it is "One book with many authors," it is much more one book with one Author, one in topics, in idea, in spirit, in word.



set my King upon my holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee." "Be still, and know that I am God: I will be exalted among the heathen, I will be exalted in the earth." "Hear, O my people, and I will speak; I am God, even thy God," etc. Though he more frequently, as he should, breathes forth the desires of man, he shows in these expressions that his language, whether to or from God, is all and always of God. Moses again and again declares that these are the *words* of the Lord your God. Whole chapters, almost whole books, he thus reports. Job sets forth God as the proclaimer of his own will and ways. The prophets' "Thus saith the Lord" sounds forth from the depths of Godhood, beneath which they sink in terror and nothingness as Isaiah fell in dust and dumbness before the revelation of the temple. Paul two or three times breaks in upon his vehement discourse, the passionate outpourings of that Spirit whose groanings cannot be uttered, with a permissive and transitory word of his own: "I speak as a man." The whole, otherwise, is by those words acknowledged by himself to be the speech of God. John utters declarations that no human writer has dared to use as to the sinless height the saved soul ascends, words that the boldest pseudo-Christian with all his effrontery fears to say. "He *cannot* sin because he is born of God." "Ye have an unction from the Holy One and know *all* things." Emerson nor Parker, Buddha nor Behmen never tread that height. They creep over sharp precipices infinitely far below. These men thus confess that they speak not of themselves. The motto of them all is, "I heard behind me a great voice as of a trumpet, saying, Write."

They have often made this a special declaration. "Holy men of old spake as they were borne along of the Holy Ghost," says one of their number, when he is giving a reason why we should heed their words as a light that shineth in a dark place. "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners SPAKE in time past unto the fathers by the prophets." "These are the true sayings (*λόγοι*, words) of God." "The *words* that I speak unto you," even Christ declares, "I," as man, "speak not of myself." "Whatsoever I command thee," is the command to Jeremiah, "thou shalt speak." In fine, *not a*



*hint is found in the Bible of a merely supervisional or guiding inspiration; while every writer confesses frequently that he is but the utterer of the words of God.\**

(3.) The presence of the divine element is seen still clearer when we compare the language of these writers in their uninspired condition with it when they are "borne along of the Holy Ghost." We are pressed to-day with the argument that there is so much of their own nature in their style, they must be its chief, if not sole authors.

Dr. Curtis surrenders almost the whole work to them under this pressure. Coleridge, the author of *Liber Librorum*, and many less bold, tread the same path. This theory springs from a natural root, but grows to an unnatural height. It is precisely akin to that theory of Christ so popular with heretics to-day, which, finding him full of humanity, declares his only Deity consists in infusion or supervision. If we examine the Bible accurately we shall see that the distinction between these writers when speaking as men and as God is the most wonderful phenomenon they exhibit. Thus Moses is petulant himself and a man of broken speech. Compare his style in his uninspired expressions at Meribah with his dying speeches in Deuteronomy, or his solemn ode on man, the ninetieth of the Psalms.

Hear David in his own and uninspired language in the historical books, and David speaking for all mankind, for God himself, in his hymns of prayer or praise. Read Solomon in

\* "It is of the *writing*, not of the men who wrote, that inspiration is directly affirmed. The words expressing the sense are written, but not the sense separate from the words. The inspiration must be the inspiration of words, since the words, and the words alone, are written. The language of the Bible undeniably suggests an immense presumption in favor of the inspiration of the words. The reiterated use of such phrases as 'Thus saith the Lord,' 'the word of the Lord,' or, in the plural, 'the words of the Lord,' as the term is employed with great frequency in the New Testament, when the plural word *cannot possibly* refer to anything but to the *separate words* making up one communication—can bear *no other meaning* than that of verbal inspiration, if the language has a *meaning at all*. Whatever reason we have for believing the Bible to contain a true revelation from God, we have equally for believing in the inspiration of the words which convey it, through which alone it is known to us."—*God's Word Written*.

Very striking is the language Christ quotes from Moses: "Every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." (ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι ἐκπορευομένῳ δια στόματος θεοῦ.) Hardly less so his own declaration, John viii, 47, in which he uses the very same words, "He that is of God heareth God's words." (τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ.)

the Apocrypha and in the Canon. Compare Paul speaking as a man by his own confession, and Paul conducting an argument that annihilates Judaic fatalism, rising on the sublimest wings of faith and vision in the eighth of Romans, sifting the sophistries of Greek and Jew, and unfolding the awful splendors of the future in that sublimest of his works, the opening chapters of the second letter to the Corinthians. How weak and human is the one, how lofty beyond all created elevation the other!

Peter in the Gospels talks like a rash, rude man, unlettered, without breadth, save in faith and fervor. In his Epistles he is another person, broad, deep, tender, strong, using his stiff Greek as deftly as an artist his clay, and filling out rounding sentences with such a fullness and quality of life as compel the greatest writers to worship him as their superior.

John is the most discussed of any writer, and is said to put the most of himself into his books. Yet, that John, the son of Zebedee, the net-mender of Galilee, had powers inherent and native which the Divine Presence could inform so as to make him speak forth such miracles of subtle and lofty thought as cheapen to paltriest dust the most wise and mystic sayings of the greatest of human poets, is a far greater marvel than to simply say, God the Holy Ghost spoke through this humble Galilean, and could as easily have uttered the same language through Mary of Magdala, the Virgin, Nathaniel, or any other of the disciples. John's native speech has no such flavor. It is boastful, self-righteous, stormy. He is called Boanerges. He aspires to the highest seat at the right hand of Christ. He strives as to who should be greatest, even up to the week before the crucifixion. He and Peter have a race to the sepulcher. He appears in the Acts courageous, prompt, defiant; not in the least speculative, meditative, or recluse. The long locks and fair features which conventional art has given him are unknown in the Scriptures. "A bearded man, armed to the teeth, is he." That portrait is the reflex of his writings, not of his biography.

Yet this son of thunder, who calls down fire from heaven on the heads of his rivals, is the most miraculous seer and sayer the world has ever known. How loaded with involuted phraseology and with rude description is the scholarly Sweden-

borg compared with this back-country laborer of a semi-savage age. Emerson's subtilty is infinite shallowness by the side of this man whose glance quietly takes in all the fullness of God. Pascal, Wordsworth, Sir Thomas Browne, Shakspeare, are tiny children in thought and language in his presence. No such imagery ever illuminated Dante's imagination in all his prolix drama, as floats before the eye of the revelator in his brief and rapid panorama. Shakspeare wears the crown of the world. Yet it changes to lusterless paste before the divinely shining brow of the dramatist of Patmos.

He is as remarkable in his style as in his ideas. The latter transcend all human knowledge save that which comes by faith. The former is equally above all human skill. Genius consists in saying the most in the least. Perfect style is seemingly no style. The highest art is no art. The nearer a writer approaches this goal the greater his fame. *Simplex munditiis* is the motto of Style. Thus severely simple is Homer, and therefore he leads his leading race in their choicest gift. Equally severe in art were their architects and sculptors. Dante's verse is of severest simplicity. Virgil and Horace surpass all Romans in limpidity and force. Wordsworth has had no rival in this century in this combination of clearness and strength. Pascal, Montaigne, and Rousseau are the only Frenchmen whose pen never puts on airs, and hence all the world runs after them.

In this highest law of style John excels all mankind. The last of the Gospels, of the Epistles, and of the Bible itself, is thus calmly and wonderfully crowned. No style in its pages attains this perfection. They intimate it and brokenly employ it, but not steadily. It looks as if God would reveal to man the model of every other style in his other books, and reserve this for his last and divinest gift. Solomon may blossom like a garden; Isaiah glow like the sun at its coming; Daniel move with the pomp of armies "to the Dorian mood of flutes and soft recorders." Jeremiah wail like a nightingale; Ezekiel burn with a blinding blaze; Moses discourse like a judge; Paul's pages may be illumined with the piled up magnificence of a setting sun; but John appears among them all with the pure white light of central day, making all their divine grandeur shadowy to his perfect radiance. His style is nearest

Christ's. His words seemed to have been filled the most with the Holy Ghost. His associate writers far transcend all human capacity; he transcends the human conception. The world will always see in his Gospel, Letters, and Apocalypse the humanly unattainable oneness of idea and speech. Here the whole Deity is known. No one can outsee, none can outspcak, the beloved disciple.

We have thus sought to trace the groundwork of the doctrine of the Church in the laws of the human mind. We have seen that the chief expounders of these laws, ancient and modern, are of one opinion as to the inherent unity of speech and thought; that the root-word is a creation, not a formation; a creation like man, for whom and by whom it comes forth from non-existence, at once a full-formed body and a full-formed soul; \* that the laws of style confirm this law of words, and require the utterer of finished thoughts to employ in their expression a finished form; that every real genius in letters as in art has his style; that the Bible has its style, uniform from Genesis to Revelation; that all its variety of style in its different human writers does not destroy this all-embracing unity; that these writers declare they are but the oracles of God; and their own style, wherever it can be found separate from these communications, shows that they do not naturally employ the fashion of speech which they, when inspired, exhibit; and that this union of their souls and the Holy Spirit is not mechanical or clock-like, but vital, harmonious, and perfectly natural, though miraculous, as was the unity of the Son of man and Son of God in Jesus Christ.

The laws of Christian faith confirm these demands of philology, letters, and the Scriptures. The heart no less than the head crieth out in his word for God, even the living God. This fact a mere calculating critic might despise; but the devout student will acknowledge its validity. Faith is the divinely appointed solvent of many difficulties. Dr. Bushnell concedes, in the opening sentences of his chief treatise on the Vicarious Sacrifice, that it is the faith of the Church which has kept it steadfast among all the waves of opinion, and even when it could not satisfy all the queries of a puffed-up reason.

\* "In the science of language we must accept roots simply as ultimate facts."

—*Lecture on Science of Language*, by MAX MÜLLER. Second Series, p. 91

The heart, where faith has its chosen seat, therefore rightly claims a voice in the debates and decisions of this question, on which our whole spiritual being hangs. Thrust the knife through a divinely written word and our life in Christ instantly dies. Make the human element predominant, or prominent even, and the divinity that it communicates to the believer disappears. A corpse, dreaded, detested, offensive, is all that is left. What, then, does the heart say on this question? What are the feelings of every Christian as he approaches the Bible? They are that God, not man, is its sole, exclusive author. We do not go to this living fountain to drink of man-hewed cisterns. Who, in his agony of conviction, as he turns to the penitential psalms, says, "I must see what David says on such occasions?" Nay, he cries out, "I would call upon God in words that he has put in my lips. His cry is my cry. The avenues of approach which he has himself cast up and trod, those I can employ to approach unto him." Whatever is our mood, if it be deep and powerful, it finds God in the Bible, its mouthpiece. Should one of its human authors presume to say, "I am your mediator," every earnest soul would instantly reply, "Who art thou, that makest thyself equal with God? Away with Isaiah, Paul, and John, if they thus assume the divine prerogatives. Not ye are we reading or conversing with in these holy words, but the Lord our God. He wrought in you as now in us. He made you the utterer of the feelings which agitate our breast. The Holy Spirit, convincing, comforting, exulting, flowed through you, as he is now through us. These are the words in which he embodies his own warnings and comforts." In such an hour of divine communion Luke and Paul, Moses and David, are no more than Wyclif and Tindal, the Seventy of Alexandria, or the Seventy of King James. God is all and in all. This is the testimony of every heart. It sees God *only* in his word. Its poems and prophecies, its arguments and edicts, its narratives and appeals, its revelations of the original and the future earth, its language and letters, are the immediate and constant outstreaming of Godhood. They see everywhere the Divine Presence, not general and episcopal, but direct, potent, omnipotent. It is God, not Moses, who writes on Sinai; God, who moves the pen of David; God, who touches the lips of Isaiah with their burn-

ing words; God, who mourns with Jeremiah over a sinful people, laden with iniquity and with the chastisement of his hand; God, who constructs the many-sided, single-souled Gospels; God, in the thrilling joys, the warning cries, of the Epistles. Everywhere he beholds His presence. He kneels, adores, and lives. In such an hour he is troubled with no difficulties. The scoff of skepticism, the patronage of semi-devotion, are alike unknown. The Bible is then the WORD of God; the word *to* him and for him, now and always, through time, perchance through eternity.

Thus the heart confirms the head, and settles the controversy. The whole man acknowledges the Bible is wholly of God.\*

We occupied our first essay in considering the nature and result of other views of inspiration than the scriptural. We have dwelt in these on the positive argument in its favor, drawn from the laws of language, the declarations of the Bible, and the demands of faith. There are still considerations that merit and need attention—the assumed contrariness of different reports of the same transaction and the same discourse; the differences between versions; its declarations as to times and numbers which are difficult to reconcile; its asserted conflict with modern science; and chiefly the fact that much of the

\* This argument for verbal inspiration is akin to the only one that is advanced in "*Liber Librorum*" for any inspiration. It agrees closely with its central idea. In its attempts to discriminate between the inspired and uninspired portions of the Bible, its sole reliance is the verifying faculty, "which it regards as being neither more nor less than *reason enlightened and sanctified by the Holy Ghost*." This is substantially identical with the testimony of the heart as above interpreted. It is, as it says, "The unction of the Holy One," whence this illumination comes. Its mistake, great and incurable, is, that it has no standard of sanctified consciousness. It claims with Semler, that whatever is to him inspired is inspired; and with Coleridge, whatever finds any reader is inspired. We agree with this author as to the value of the testimony of sanctified consciousness, but do not agree that this is the sole or chief ground of inspiration; nor that whatever any individual's consciousness does not feel is not therefore inspired. The authority of inspiration is higher. It is in the necessity of revelation and the declaration of God. Yet this law protects it. The accumulated "sanctified consciousness" of all Christians will cover its every word. "The verifying faculty" of many a prisoner for Christ has proved the inspiration of one of the most condemned passages—the cloak of Paul. The same "verifying faculty" in Bengel found great inspiration in the genealogies of Christ. Let even this ground be clung to firmly, and the true doctrine of universal, verbal inspiration will be inevitably developed.



Bible seems, nay, is and must be a perfect expression of the feelings and thoughts of the man that is speaking; these are the chief points of objection to ipsissimal inspiration. We have no space for their examination, nor is it essential to our argument. What we aim at is, to confirm the true idea of inspiration. If this is rooted and grounded in us we can proceed more or less successfully to answer all the problems that gather around the mystery. If Christ is affirmed to be a mere man by the worldly school, and a divinely-supervised man by even Christian teachers, it is essential to prove his supreme and personal Deity. We may or may not be able to show how the two natures mingle in him without loss of conscious distinction; how he could be born of a virgin and yet be the Son of God. These mysteries and difficulties are one thing, the fact of his Godhead is another.

So we have aimed to prove the logical, philological, emotional, and scriptural necessity of verbal inspiration. We may or we may not succeed in showing how such inspiration can be made through the willing activity of human minds, as Mary willingly consented to become the mother of our Lord, yet did not thereby become herself the Lord, or in any sense divine. We may and may not show which is the exact copy of the original book, and how repeated phrases from the same speech may properly differ. These are matters for prolonged and profound study. Many books have been written upon them and will yet be. The other is the great central fact around which the study centers, in which it has its sole strength and being.

It is precisely as with any other study. The existence of the earth must be granted before we can proceed to discuss its nature. If the former were denied, all natural science must pause till it is re-established. The fact of verbal inspiration must precede all discussion as to the preservation of the Bible, the mutual relations of its several parts and words, and its relations to science and history.

Of these minor matters we have space but to suggest a very few thoughts. The preservation of the Bible is another subject than its inspiration. Have we the original? is one question. Was that original directly from God? is another. When we consider the watchcare of God over his word as seen in the



Jewish age, in the labors of the Masorites, in the foundation of schools for its preservation, in their remarkable rules concerning it, in the no less vehement zeal of Christians in all subsequent ages, we may well conclude that our volume is the original text given to Moses, David, and Paul. If a little debris shall have fallen from this mountain it need not surprise us, nor diminish our faith in the solidity of the peak which yet pierces the heavens. When we remember through what ages of desolation, iniquity, barbarism, and darkness the Bible has stood, we may well expect some scars upon its sides, some crumbling at its feet.

A few of its sheets probably went through the corruption of the antediluvian age and rode on the waves of the destroying deluge. One book went down into Egypt and was hidden for four hundred years in the clay-huts of ignorant, idolatrous, brutalized slaves. Five books survived a barbaric existence in the wilderness, and a more barbaric period under the judges, and were preserved alone by a savage race, who were often in captivity to their hardly more savage neighbors, hiding like wild beasts in the caverns of their hills. Increased to one half its present size, it was carried with a scattered remnant into captivity to a power that for thousands of years has been blotted from the face of the earth. It was hidden in low, black tents, along the Euphrates, in the care of uneducated and oftentimes ungodly men. Its appointed keepers were generally sunken in idolatry, and cared nothing for the treasure they held in their hands. It came up from the house of bondage, only to find a more stormy and perilous home in a warring, fanatic nation, which for hundreds of years was the seat of constant and indescribable fighting and plotting, such as the world has seldom seen. Read Milman or Josephus and see how seemingly impossible it was that the Old Testament should survive the era of Antiochus and the Maccabees.

Not less severe has been the struggle of the New Testament for existence. It has been far more severe. No Jewish sect arose and ruled that strove for centuries to destroy their sacred books. But the Bible after its completion was subjected to that trial. For more than a thousand years the sole ruling representative of the Church put forth its utmost strength to destroy the Holy Scriptures. It raged against the word of

God more than against all other real or fancied foes. It abolished it from every church and house. It forbade its perusal on pain of horrible death. It sprung at those who dared defy this decree and cast them into the fire. It hunted down Wyclif, Tyndale, Huss, Jerome, as they arose on the long night and held forth the word of life—a light shining in a dark, dark place. Through this crucible the Bible has come to us. Through the apostasy of its appointed preservers, through their unspeakable hate and ferocity, through savagery, idolatry, slavery, persecution, through the weary, black and barbarous centuries where man appears too often more like a beast of prey than a child of God, comes to our age and eyes the Book of God. What other work has outlived such fires of death? Its visage should be more marred than its kindred of purely human origin. Yet its countenance is unchanged. It still shines in its strength. The spots on its disk but intensify its brightness. It is now as always the face of God, enlightening all reverent gazers with his everlasting beams.

It may seem to conflict with science, though it is wonderful how science is ever confirming its declarations. The latest assault of skeptical learning on the original man but proves its position; for it declares man fell before the first child was born, and the infidel scholar says the first *people* were savages. In all these conflicts it has thus far maintained its integrity. It will in all time to come.

It may seemingly conflict with itself, but this does not destroy its authorship. Often the difference is only seeming, as where Dean Alford makes his strongest point against verbal inspiration—the different mottoes over the cross. They can all be read consistent with this theory, if we remember there were three inscriptions there. (He says there was but one.) Each of three evangelists may copy a different one, while the two who copy the same may give it, the one in full, the other only in part. If the difference is real, it may be attributed to the dictation, as well as it is by the orthodox opponents of this doctrine to the supervision, of the Holy Ghost. He could have given the versions as well as allowed two men to use two when there was actually but one. This is fully exhibited in the matter of quotations, and as fully and unanswerably defended by

the eloquent Gaussen, the ablest writer of our age on this subject. Most of these differences will be removed on thorough study, and those that we cannot understand may yield to the superior knowledge of a subsequent age.

But all these problems are unsolved in the weaker theory. If God kept its authors from essential errors, how can they explain these difficulties? By calling them non-essential? But calling them so does not make them so. The world without persists in declaring these errors as essential? These allies concede the first and not the last. No one accepts their testimony. They are *not* unessential. If Colenso be true, his figures destroy the authority of the Bible. They have destroyed its validity to him. So if Alford's concessions be granted, or Curtis's,\* or others of this school, the whole work crumbles to naught. We stand or fall together. If the Ipsissimists cannot keep their ground none can. Their brethren who oppose them cannot live without them.

We intended to have shown that these objectors ran to this refuge for shelter when struck by any stray shot of the enemy; for the foe never waste much ammunition intentionally upon their dogma. No skeptic writes against *Liber Librorum*. Why should he? But the best of these, seeing whither this course leads them, are careful to interpose caveats. They demand such a veracity of the Bible as only verballity can give. Alford, Nast, and even Coleridge, protest against any mixture of real error in the text after they have declared it has much error.† They

\* Dr. Curtis openly affirms all that Colenso does. He sees only fallibility and error, though he covers the dead body he has dissected with a pall of courteous and half-believing phrases. Every one affected with supervisionsal inspiration should read that work, and see whither they are tending. Compare it with Bernard and Garbett and Gaussen, and learn that scholarship and faith are still united and victorious.

† It will be my object to establish the infallible certainty, the indisputable authority, the perfect and entire truthfulness of all and every part of the Holy Scripture. (See, p. 33.)

By inspiration the human mind is enabled correctly to apprehend and then authentically and authoritatively, make known orally or in *writing* a revelation which God has given of himself.—*Nast's Prolog.*, p. 36.

Coleridge beautifully says, "In the Bible there is more that *finds* me than I have experienced in all other books put together. The *words* of the Bible find me at greater depths of my being; and whatever finds me brings with it irresistible evidence of its having proceeded from the Holy Ghost."—*Conf. of an Inquiring Spirit*, Letter II.

seek to avoid the rock on which they founder by declaring its inviolable truthfulness "*in all matters pertaining to religion*,"\* and its resemblance to Christ, who had the frailties of man as well as the fullness of God.† But did Christ ever err? Or is there anything in the Bible that does not pertain to religion? This concession and comparison surrender the whole defense. Better by far affirm the fact of oral and written inspiration, and proceed to its defense and elucidation.

It is a fit comparison, that of the twofold Christ and the twofold authorship of the Scriptures. These writers miraculously became dynamically, not mechanically, naturally, though supernaturally, occupied by the Holy Ghost. The Holy Spirit brooded over their spirit. Therefore the holy thing that was born of them was called the Word of God. We cannot, we may never fathom the mystery. We cannot, we may never, that of the incarnation, the atonement, the resurrection. But its harmony with them, its consistency with the work of redemption, its analogy to the nature of Christ himself, are confirmations of the Scriptures themselves and of the laws of language that make this truth invulnerable.‡

Thus stands forth the Word of God, like him from whom it was named, who was in the beginning with God and was God. It is the pillar and ground of the Church, of the world. Through the ages, the hostilities, the contempt, the criticism of man it lifts itself up fresh and strong as the eternal heavens. It is not only the first begotten, it is the only begotten of God. All other words and works must worship it. From its urn alone can they draw the light that is celestial. Let its every student prostrate himself before its unquestioned divinity. Here read the thought and language of God. Study his words in all their subtle and far-reaching meaning. Explore

\* Whatever the inspired writers affirm to be true, if it has the remotest reference to religion, is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and they never declare anything to be scientifically true which is scientifically false.—NAST, p. 138.

† Elliot's *Aids to Faith*, p. 479.

‡ This debate is exactly identical with that now in progress concerning Christ. He was divine, say some complimentary critics, but yet had imperfections. Rénan and Collier affirm, and Ecce Homo once or twice implies, that he had errors which he outgrew. Even so do these speak of the Bible. They must stand in this debate as in that. Christ, the Incarnate Word, was errorless, or he was not God. The Bible, the written word, is errorless, or it is not divine, authoritative, or of the least *vital*, saving value to the immortal soul.

their combinations in every form of expression, whether of proverb or parable, of statement or song. God will be found everywhere present, informing each page, each book, each writer with his controlling influence. Harmony will arise from seeming discord; the divine idea and speech will shine through every sentence; and all the far-distant, and, to a careless student, far-disjointed works, be pervaded by a harmony as marvelous as that which appears in its antitype and inferior, Nature. Every book is in its place, no less than every portion of every book, and perfect symmetry, power, and divinity possesses the perfect Word. More and more will this be seen in the coming glory of the Church and her Christ. No one will then doubt its verbal inspiration any more than they will the divine creation of every particle in nature, the divine renewal of every believer, the divine origin of the Church, and the supreme divinity of its Lord and Redeemer.

May all Christian scholarship accept the decision of modern philology, of the laws of language, of the sanctified instincts of the faithful, of the historic Church, of the Scriptures themselves, and with the angel of the Apocalypse ever declare that "these are the true *words* of GOD!"

---

## ART. II.—LIMITS BETWEEN PHYSIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY.

*The Senses and the Intellect.* By ALEXANDER BAIN, M.A., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Aberdeen. Second Edition. Pp. 640. London: Longmans & Co. 1864.

*The Emotions and the Will.* By the same author. Pp. 616. Second Edition. 1865.

*Cours de Philosophie Positive.* Par AUGUST COMTE. Repetiteur d'analyse transcendante et de mécanique rationnelle à l'école polytechnique, et Examinateur des Candidats qui se destinent, à cette école. Deuxième Edition. Augmentée d'un préface par E. Littré, et d'un table alphabétique des matières. Six Volumes. Paris: J. B. Baillière et Fils. 1864.

*The Physiology and Pathology of the Mind.* By HENRY MAUDSLEY, M.D., London. New York: Appleton & Co. 1867.

*Essays, Philosophical and Theological.* By JAMES MARTINEAU. Boston. 1866.

"THE necessity of making-Physiology the basis of Psychology is gradually becoming recognized even among metaphysicians."

"Though very imperfect as a science, Physiology is still suf-

ficiently advanced to prove that no Psychology can endure except it be based upon its investigations." These passages, which are taken, both of them, from comparatively recent and, in many respects, able works, express somewhat mildly what is at this day the deliberate conviction of a large number of respectable thinkers. That conviction is, that what they call the "Old Psychology," based on mental phenomena, such as intellections, emotions, and volitions as revealed in consciousness, is utterly invalid; nay, that consciousness itself is entirely untrustworthy, and that our only hope is to turn to the corporeal organism with which mind is connected, and construct a new Psychology based upon the phenomena furnished by the organs of sense, brain, and nerves. The proposition to base Psychology on Physiology—or, rather, to merge the former in the latter—is, to say the least, not novel. In Great Britain since the time of Hartley, and in France since the time of Condillac, has such a purpose been clearly manifested. But in the past few years numerous persons eminent in science, both in Europe and this country, have devoted themselves to reviving this almost forgotten theory under more promising auspices.

It may not be unprofitable to inquire, briefly, how the predisposition to adopt this theory arises in the minds of scientific thinkers, before entering directly on the subject in hand.

1. Certain speculative doctrines have contributed to this result. There are three great modes of construing the phenomenal world which have been marked with more or less distinctness through the entire history of philosophic thought from its beginning up to the present day, but unequally so at different periods. They may be briefly stated as follows: 1. All phenomena have been analyzed into mind, giving as a result *Idealism*. 2. All phenomena have been analyzed into matter, thus yielding the various forms of *Materialism*. 3. Finally, phenomena have been so analyzed as to be ranged about two distinct, though correlative, centers, *mind* and *matter*, giving as a result, *Dualism*, or *Natural Realism*.

Not only are these three great paths through the phenomenal world conspicuous on a general survey of speculative thought, but at the same time, numerous deviations from them, as from *Realism* toward *Idealism* on the one hand, or *Materialism* on the other, or from these two extremes toward the intermediate



grounds of *Realism*. It has been in tracing, analyzing, and distributing these deviations that the most formidable difficulties in the history of philosophy have arisen.

But all opinions and systems occupying intermediate grounds between these lines must give way to ultimate logical analysis, and yield their contents to be ranged in linear subordination to one or other of them.

Idealism swayed the world of thought, at least from Plato, to near the time of Bacon. A reaction occurred, and since about the day of the latter, the tendency has been toward the Materialistic\* or opposite pole of thought. Since the time of Bacon, to go no further back, men as a whole have had their gaze fixed on the objective world, and they have been exhorted and directed to examine and study it as it actually appears to sensuous observation. As a consequence, in attaining to a knowledge of the natural or outer world, the past two or three centuries have eclipsed in practical concrete results what had been achieved in the entire previous history of the race.

But this reaction against *Idealism* has formed no exception to the general law in such cases, which shows that in reactions a true mean or conservative limit is almost uniformly passed. In this instance men, in turning to the *objects* of knowledge, or outer world, in great measure lost sight of the *subject* of knowledge—the *mind*.

2. Certain so-called scientific conceptions have contributed to this result. The only one to which we will call attention now, is that variously enunciated in such terms and phrases as "evolution," "progress," the conversion or "change of the homogeneous into the heterogeneous," the "one" into the "many," etc. It cannot be better defined, perhaps, than it has been by the thinker who has seized it with the firmest and most consistent grasp, namely, Mr. Spencer. It has been applied by Comte, Buckle, and Draper to history, by Darwin, Huxley, and others to zoology, and has been carried by Mr. Spencer to all departments of inquiry, and among others to Psychology.

This conception makes it necessary to begin with the lowest or most fundamental phenomena, or the simplest factors attain-

\* The term *Materialistic* is here used in its philosophical and most general sense. The signification it often has in theological usage is not that intended here.



able. These factors are two in number, *matter* and *force*; the former being that *in* which all changes occur, the latter their *cause*.

These factors constitute the point of departure, of the "evolution," which on this basis proceeds. This is done by a series of "differentiations" in either, and between both of them. The result is, that each is resolved into several *sub-factors*, or *special forms* of matter and force. While these agree among themselves according to their class in important respects, yet they have *somehow* come to differ in some particulars. By reacting on each other according to their differences, they give rise to other and more complex forms of matter and force. Each advance that is made in the "evolution," the results are more and more complex continuously, and so on *ad infinitum*. The procedure is from the "homogeneous" to the "heterogeneous," from the "simple" to the "complex," from the "general" to the "special." From these co-ordinate factors, or "primitive germs," the whole system of the phenomenal world is "evolved."

The *substance*, as already remarked, in which all changes are wrought is *matter*. The *cause* of all change, of whatsoever kind, is *force*. The *typical idea* and essential germ of force is obtained at the outset of the evolution, and is nothing more nor less than *physical force*. It is not only the tendency, but the deliberate *aim* to analyze all phenomena, whatsoever their kind, into one or other or both these factors, as their necessary and sufficient basis. Proceeding on this assumption, that part of the natural world is first entered wherein we find matter and force in their simplest forms and manifestations—the *inorganic*. Guided through it by the conception of "evolution from the simple to the complex," the advance is made upward through physics to chemistry, and beyond, where we begin almost insensibly to meet more complex and special phenomena, or those of *life*. The latter are new, it is admitted; but it is believed they are capable of being resolved back into the two factors we began with. There has been simply a series of "differentiations," "combinations," and "unfoldings." The phenomena are more complex in their "relations of coexistence and sequence"—this is all.

Ascending under the guidance of our "law of evolution"

through the domain of living beings, from the lowest vegetable to the most exalted animal forms, we begin to meet with a new order of phenomena, usually called *mental*. These *seem* to be radically different from what we had met with before, but the difference is *only* a seeming. The "law of progress," or "evolution from the simple to the complex," proves equal to the emergency, and by the light thus afforded, a sharp analysis reveals the fact there is nothing here at all, or at most nothing worth mentioning, save *matter* and *force*. And so on to the end, until all phenomena, physical, intellectual, and moral, have been subordinated to the sway of this comprehensive law.

As this all-pervading conception has furnished the talismanic power, in obedience to which the *objects* of knowledge have fallen into progressive order, so has it determined the relations and order of our knowledges.

The classification hitherto made, in which, except in view of subordinate distinctions, the sciences have been ranged in at least two classes, "physical" and "mental," is abolished. Beginning, according to the terms of the law, with the simplest or most fundamental of the sciences, the advance is made, not on two parallel or co-ordinate lines simultaneously, as formerly, but on *one* line; from physics to chemistry, from chemistry to physiology, from physiology to psychology, and from psychology to "sociology," finding somewhere at the remote end of the line along which the evolution has occurred *morals* and *religion*. "Given certain elements, say matter and force," the language seems to be, "and aided by the law of evolution, we will from this simple beginning progressively unfold before you the entire cosmos, and among other things all that is characteristic in the mental and moral natures of men. We will account for the history of the race in the past, for its present state, and guided by this modern prophetic gift called 'prevision,' will map out its future."

Once permit this to become the dominant conception in the mind, while engaged in construing and interpreting the phenomena of the natural world, and it will be easy to predict what kind of an influence it will exert in shaping the constructive side of science. The conviction will, as it often has, fasten on the mind, that the elements and processes employed in the beginning are competent to solve every problem

presented, and account for every phenomenon met with as we ascend. Fascinated by the simplicity of this cumulative and majestic conception, the introduction of any *new* element to participate in the evolution is instinctively resisted. As the scientist proceeds rapidly to reduce to order and unity the phenomena of the *physical* world under this generalization, he is impelled to yield himself to its guidance as he enters successively the domains of *life* and *mind*. There are but two alternatives here. Either we must admit, as they seem to be required, *new* elements, or fabricate new combinations from the old to explain new phenomena, and to solve new problems.

The latter alternative has been accepted by many in comparatively recent times. It has led men to insist that psychology of necessity must rest on physiology, which is next below it in a descending order, that it may have any valid foundation. To be in harmony with the leading conception in this phase of thought, they are required to deny explicitly, or virtually, as they successively reach in their progress life and mind, the necessity of employing any other elements, aside from matter, than the physical forces traced up from below. It is this necessity which compels Prof. Bain, for example, in defining life to say: "What is called vitality (or life) is *not a peculiar force*, but a *collocation* of the *forces of inorganic matter* in such way as to keep up a *living organism*." The same may be said when we come to mind, which is said to be a "*derivative* from life." It is this necessity which compels that fervent and honest apostle of science, Prof. Huxley, to declare he can see no excuse for doubting there is no essential difference between "blind force and conscious intellect and will." But to go no further in this direction, we may remark that to the two tendencies in modern thought now noticed, in conjunction with others less conspicuous, must we ascribe this demand for a new basis for psychology, one which renders it in reality only an outgrowth of physiology, upon which it is absolutely dependent.

The thinker in recent times to whose influence this state of things is largely due, and who may be considered the type of his class, is August Comte. Some of the most active and fertile thinkers in this country and Europe have caught their inspiration from his "Positive Philosophy," and some have

been touched more deeply by it than they are willing to admit.

We have now inquired in some measure into the causes which have conspired to lay the task of bringing forth a new psychology on physiology; let us inquire in what manner it has been accomplished.

There are two points of view from which this examination may be conducted. The one is *external*, the other *internal*.

1. But first the *external*. In this case the first thing to be done is to define briefly, but accurately as we can, the *limits* commonly supposed to circumscribe what these terms respectively denote. Tried in any legitimate way, Physiology may be defined as the "science of life," Psychology as the "science of mind." The one is essentially a science of *external* or sensuous observation; the other one of *internal* observation, or of what passes in self-consciousness, though much that belongs to physiology may be observed extramentally in our own persons on the one hand, while, on the other, much that belongs to psychology may be found in the speech, actions, and other signs, manifested by our fellow-beings around us. But if we should decide the phenomena, in both cases, to be given alike in sensuous perception, there is still an important difference.

We interpret the facts of physiology just as we do those of chemistry or geology. They have to us mainly a *scientific* interest. But with psychology their *scientific* is subordinate to their sympathetic or *human* interest. In order to interpret the thought and emotion, symbolized in the speech, action, and writings of those about us, it must and can *only* be because *we* have or have had like thoughts and emotions with those who offer us these otherwise enigmatical signs. Were it not for this we might note accurately the "relations of coexistence and sequence" among such phenomena, but they would be emptied of that interior significance by which they now are so profoundly distinguished from mere *physical* phenomena.

Accordingly, the material for physiology is obtained by observations made alike on plants and animals, the physiologist seldom, or of necessity *never*, resorting to his own person. But in psychology the case is completely reversed, for here we *must* turn to ourselves, to what is revealed in our own consciousness, and we might go on and construct a tolerably complete

psychology from a study of what passes in our own minds. The one has as its field all animated or *living* nature, while the other has no concern about plants, but little about animals except the higher, and even there deals only with certain border phenomena, as sense, habit, instinct, and the like, but finds its most distinctive field only when we come to *man*. It will thus be seen that from an external contemplation of what these terms are commonly admitted to comprehend, a radical difference in import appears. If these definitions are admissible, it will be further seen that psychologists have often imported into their science matter for which they were indebted to physiology; and that, on the other hand, physiologists are in the habit of transcending the strict limits of their science, dragging within its scope facts foreign to its domain, but which are enumerated and employed as physiological data. In this way have physiologists reached results, to the attainment of which physiology is not competent. Men have been often ready to fancy they have found a legitimate passage from one science to the other when they have simply overleaped the limits of one or the other, and, regardless of important distinctions, are commingling the phenomena of *life* and *mind*.

That this has been done it is quite an easy task to show. There is no objection to mingling the data of any two sciences, however distinct, so long as it is done with a legitimate purpose, and does not afterward escape recognition. But the psychologist has no right to appropriate the phenomena of *life as such* without an acknowledgment, either tacit or explicit, of his indebtedness to physiology, nor, conversely, has the physiologist any right to appropriate mental phenomena in treating physiology without a recognition of their true character.

It is true these sciences are closely related; so is physiology equally close in its relations on the other side to chemistry. But for this reason, physiology can with no more propriety absorb the one science than the other.

It is moreover true, that any one who chooses may so extend the limits of Physiology as to include mental phenomena, in violation of the authority of etymology and usage, or may ignore the phenomena of mind, as has been done, in violation of the asseverations of consciousness. But in either case the

ground of controversy is changed, in one to that of the authority of generally accepted definitions, in the other to the question of the reality of the existence of mind.

So far as this *external* examination has gone, the two sciences, while closely related, seem to be radically distinct. If the remarks made be just, then it must follow that such phrases as "mental physiology," or "physiology of mind," for the latter of which we are indebted to Dr. Brown, are misleading and uncalled for. *Biology*, though a somewhat more comprehensive term in scientific usage than physiology, is, properly speaking, only a synonym for the latter. *Anthropology*, when we come to analyze it, is found to break up into component sciences, among which both physiology and psychology find a place.

2. Having completed so much of the external survey as suits our purpose, let us now turn attention to an examination and comparison of some of the leading objects within the pale of these sciences respectively, with the view of ascertaining in *this* way whether their relations are of such an intimate character as physiological psychologists would have us believe.

Passing by the numerous attempts made since the time of Hartley, we come at once down to the present time, and for the sake of a definite view will confine attention mainly to the fullest, and in some respects ablest, and as it seems to be conceded most successful attempt, which has perhaps ever been made. We now refer to the elaborate work in two volumes, entitled respectively, the "Senses and the Intellect," and the "Emotions and the Will," by Prof. Alexander Bain, of Aberdeen, Scotland, who is evidently not surpassed by any member of the school to which he belongs in his qualifications for executing such a task.

In chemistry we have various kinds of matter called *elements*. These, by combining with each other in various ways and proportions, in obedience to regulated chemical forces, yield us the almost innumerable compounds we are able to obtain. The compounds should present nothing on analysis except what the elements gave them. The illustration afforded by chemistry is indeed a favorite one with this school. They delight in placing before you certain *elements*, and by combining these in various ways and proportions, according



to the "laws of association," their psychological system is reared.

In like manner Prof. Bain begins with certain "elements," or "primitive germs," derived from physiology, and by a dexterous use of the above-mentioned laws, compounds therefrom, or professes to do so, the phenomena usually assigned to psychology. There are two points in such a case to which attention should be directed. They are, *first*, to scrutinize closely the elements begun with; and *second*, the various steps of the process of combining as the synthesis proceeds. The elements laid down in beginning may be too few, making it necessary to introduce *new* elements, as the exposition passes along, or the method of combining them may be illegitimate. With the class of psychologists to which Prof. Bain belongs, whatever may be the errors in *method* into which they have fallen, they have failed to agree on the number and nature of *the elements, or factors, to begin with*. What *are* the elements which physiology offers, out of which the facts of our mental and moral natures are to be compounded? They are simply "*sensibility*," or, at most, "*sensation*" and "*motion*." We have surveyed the entire field of physiology, and can find nothing, aside from what these two terms embrace, that will be of any service in solving the problem before us. "*Sensation*" and "*motion*" are, in fact, the elements with which Prof. Bain starts out.

In the scheme of Hartley, *motion*, or "vibrations," were supposed to account for all the phenomena. To most of the disciples of the Lockean school it is enough to give sensations. But Prof. Bain takes both these elements along, and here one of his peculiar merits lies. All he seems to require to begin with is a rudimentary organism, endowed with *capacities* to *feel* and to *move*. These capacities exist at first only potentially. But somehow they must be brought into activity, that the unfolding may begin.

The initial step, we are told, is a muscular movement, for "*movement precedes sensation*, and is at the outset independent of any stimulus from without." This movement begets a sensation; the organism becoming *aware* of this sensation, there is *consciousness*. Such is the order of phenomena in waking the organism into active, conscious existence. These



phenomena, quite familiar apart from each other, are given as transpiring in fetal, or infant life, a period about which memory does not give us the faintest intimations in personal experience; neither were these presumed facts observed directly by any one at the period in which they must have occurred, and in the required relations. How, then, were these vital points in his system ascertained, and their order determined? What authority have we for the validity of this account? It is true such *might* have been. If the account is *true* it must be *known* as such, then *how* is it known? The truth is, the only supports such statements have are *analogies*, which lend an air of probability to the account, and this is *all*.

The psychologist fearlessly appeals to consciousness as authority, and the physiologist to the evidence of the senses; but here the foundation on which the system rests is placed beyond the direct reach of either of these tests. Is a system calculated to inspire us with confidence which hides its genesis from *direct* sensuous observation and consciousness, and which in this way tries to shun the only tests of validity a system can offer, giving us probabilities where we have a right to demand at least a basis of certainty? But admitting the account as true, let us examine it more closely.

Then, first, as to the *initial* movement. Prof. Bain says, "We are laboring to establish . . . a tendency in the moving system to go into action, without *any* antecedent sensation from *without* or emotion from *within*, or without *any* stimulus extraneous to the moving apparatus itself." The movement is, in fact, "*spontaneous*."

This "*spontaneity*" of movement on the part of the *voluntary* muscles is one of the cardinal features in Prof. Bain's system.

He says, "the fact of spontaneous activity I look upon as the essential prelude to voluntary power; in other words, *volition* is a *compound* made up of this and something else." Elsewhere he says, "a spontaneous movement" and a "sensation *both* are necessary to give us a *volitional act*." What does the statement about the "*spontaneity*" of movements amount to? That they have no assignable cause. But why not assign a *cause* for this obvious *effect*? Because to do this would, in Prof. Bain's system, lead to one of two difficulties.

Either in assigning a *cause* for the supposed movement, he must anticipate his explanation of our *belief* in an *external world*, or virtually concede this in postulating an *object* to cause the movement, or he must refer it to a *volition*, in which case he concedes, contrary to his purpose at this early stage of the exposition, a *mind self-active*.

To avoid these admissions, the "hypothesis of spontaneity" was devised. To find an *external world*, or a *mind*, at this period, would be altogether premature.

But in avoiding Scylla, he falls into Charybdis. For if he wholly frees this movement from a *cause*, as he seemingly does in calling it "spontaneous," his doctrine is brought into conflict with one of the deepest axioms of all science, which declares "that every *effect* or *phenomenon* must have a *cause*." There is no way to escape this dilemma. The questions raised are such, that the philosophy which declines to answer them sets the seal of its own incompetency. This part of the exposition does not satisfy our sense of certainty, and fails to ground, or root itself, in any one of the fundamental postulates of intelligence. This attempt to lay the foundation of *voluntary power*, which is a distinguishing mark of mind, is not only unfortunate, but is a failure. This determination of the *order* of mental phenomena, at the dawn of individual existence, is, to say the least, purely hypothetical.

But we cannot proceed further until we have examined the second of the two elements furnished us out of which to weave the web of Psychology, namely, *sensibility* or *sensation*.

The latter term designates one of the most common battle-fields in philosophy, and what is certainly the enchanted ground between Physiology and Psychology. No term in the vocabulary of philosophy needs more urgently to be fenced about with strict limitations. This can only be done by approaching it from two sides, the physiological and psychological. It leaves us in a border land between the two sciences, and our previous predilections will have much to do in determining us as to where we are—when we enter it, whether on physiological or psychological ground. Until the limits of this term, as well as others, are fixed more rigidly than they have commonly been, there can be no accord. Sensation will be made to invade consciousness, and, con-

versely, consciousness will be made to invade the domain of sensation. To give a critical review of the history of this term, and of the various phases of signification it has suffered, even since the time of Locke, would require a separate article. The superlative importance it has among the terms used in psychology can be readily seen from the place it occupies in all systems, especially those of Condillac, Cabanis, James Mill, John Stuart Mill, and Prof. Bain, not to mention a host of others.

We are aware of the difficulty of giving a positive definition of sensation. We can show, however, what it is *not*; that it is not thought, imagination, memory, judgment, faith, love, etc., nor by any legitimate process can be made to develop into these.

But, first of all, we notice that the term as rightly employed in physiology cannot comprehend all it does in psychology. The terms "susceptibility," or "*sensibility*," would much better designate what the physiologist has to deal with.

That property of most living bodies which enables them, when any foreign body is brought into contact with them, to become *aware* of the contact, and which is manifested by appropriate signs, is called "*sensibility*." We refer these signs to the *property* of "*sensibility*," just as we do others to "*elasticity*," "*contractility*," etc. When we witness such signs we have not *had* a sensation, but because of the agreement of the signs manifested with those which accompany certain affections in our own persons, we *infer* there *has been* or *is* sensation.

Evidently this differs in measure, if not in kind, from the case where we *have* a sensation in *our own bodies*. In the first case we would never become *conscious* of what a sensation *is*. It would be as remote from our consciousness and our sympathy as *elasticity* or *attraction*. But in the other case it is a conscious personal experience, not only *known* but *felt*, not only *inferred* but *experienced*. The former mode of looking at this affection is what properly falls under the survey of the physiologist, the latter under that of the psychologist. However inseparable these may be in our actual experience, we must nevertheless maintain the distinction in *thought*.

There is no objection to the physiologist appealing to his own personal experience, or his *consciousness*, to enable him to

*interpret* the phenomena given in sensuous preception; but it must be remembered when this is permitted he is in the distinctive realm of consciousness, and once *on* this ground, there is none but an arbitrary stopping place until all the phenomena which appear in consciousness are given him. He will be giving his sensuous observations, or external objects, a significance, really transfused into them by the interpretations of consciousness.

The fact is we meet here, as we will at every turn, the great antithesis between the objective and subjective, the ideal and concrete, the internal and external, the material and immaterial, by *ignoring* or abolishing which such harm has been wrought in both science and philosophy, and the clear acknowledgement of which lies at the foundation of all that is enduring of either. We insist on it, the facts of physiology depend on *external* or sensuous observation, while those of psychology depend on *internal* observation. Physiology may make all the use of the facts of psychology its legitimate purposes require, and *vice versa*. But we must *not* lose sight of the distinction between the two sciences just laid down, under penalty of damaging confusion.

Sensation is not only an affection of the *organism*, but also of the *mind*. The former must always, at least primarily, precede the latter. The mind becomes *aware* of its state, or *knows itself* as affected. This power to become *aware* of or *know* its own states or acts is called *consciousness*. We speak truly when we say we are conscious of a sensation, but we should never confound sensation *with* consciousness. We can only have a true sensation when we have *first* an affection of the organism, and as a consequence an affection of the *mind*.

But we may be conscious not only of *such* affections of the mind, but of others not thus originated that are *not* sensations. Here, then, emerges what seems to be a clear distinction between sensation and consciousness.

But admitting sensation, as dealt with by the physiologist, comprehends all it confessedly does in general usage in psychology, and recognizing a distinction between sensation and consciousness, it may still further be shown that sensation differs from other mental and from moral phenomena so widely as to render it a hopeless task ever to convert the one

into the others. By no *quasi* chemical process we have any knowledge of can the mere state of "*sensation*," or "*feeling*," (if we consider these terms as synonymous,) be converted into a *knowing* state. While we cannot now enter into detail at this point, we remark that we must either admit there are distinct capacities or powers, properly called *cognitive* or *knowing*, or we must admit, as the only admissible alternative, the paradox on which Mr. Mill is lauded when he says: "If, therefore, we speak of the mind as a series of feelings, (or sensations,) we are *obliged* to complete the statement by calling it a *series* of feelings (or sensations) which is *aware* of *itself* as past and future; and we are reduced to the alternative of believing that the mind, or *ego*, is *something different* from any series of feelings, or *any possibilities* of them, or of accepting the *paradox* that something which *ex hypothesi* is but a *series of feelings*, is *aware* of itself as a series." The truth is, any one who attempts to merge sensation or feeling into cognition will meet with the same difficulty that the clear-sightedness and candor of Mr. Mill has revealed to him. The failure which Mr. Mill makes and bravely acknowledges is really the failure made by all sensational psychologists at this vital point, whether it is recognized or not. There is a profound and impassable distinction between mere *feeling* and *cognition*.

We pass to another important distinction laid down, among others, by Mr. Martineau in an able article on "Cerebral Psychology." It is this: "A sense *cannot make efforts*." In other words, sensation is *passive*, while many of our intellectual powers are *active*. We cannot see or hear or taste or feel at *will*. Nor can we *prevent* sensation at will. But we *can think*, imagine, judge, or reason at will.

In fact, from this matter of sensation, examine its contents as we may, nothing can be obtained which by any legitimate process will yield thought, or any *one* of the distinctively intellectual or moral acts or faculties. Neither are we aided by combining *motion* with sensation.

But let us turn for some assistance to the structure with which mind is connected. We have examined the statements of Prof. Bain, more particularly in the "Senses and the Intellect," concerning the anatomy of the muscular and nervous system and the various organs of sense. The descriptions are

drawn principally from the anatomical works of Sharpey and Quain. Also his ever-recurring statements about "nerve currents," in which he and all others of his class with him *assume* the existence of a "nervous fluid," and likewise his statements about the "recoverability" of these currents, but we fail to find mental phenomena explained by any such means. These matters, interesting as they are on many accounts, even in their psychological relations, are for our present purpose remote and external to us. Indeed, our sense of fitness and propriety is constantly violated by the use of *physical* terms to designate *mental* processes. What clearness or advantage is secured by the employment of such expressions as the following: "Revived sensations," "*plastic* growth of mind," "adhesiveness of verbal trains," "*adhesion* of impressions," "*wave* of sensation," "*cohesive* principle," "*cohesion* of mental *trains* of movement," "mental *adhesions*," and others of like kind?

After we have faithfully examined the anatomy of the nervous system and organs of sense, and have taken our microscope to our aid, and have sought out cells and granules, and masses of cells or *ganglia*, and fibers connecting these cells and ganglia with one another on the one hand, and with the muscular and sensitive parts of the organism on the other, and after we have admitted, as we may, that *currents* are passing hither and thither, while power seems to be lodged *here*, the seat of sensation seeming to be *there*, and movement occurs somewhere else, what is it we see? Is it thought, or hope, or joy, or faith, or our ideas of right, wrong, the true, the beautiful, or the good? Nothing but cells and fibers and imaginary currents, and forces known to exist only by the purest inference. This is all. We are as remote from a true knowledge of the real nature and character of our invisible mental and moral faculties, acts, and states, as we would be after contemplating any other mechanism. We have only been looking on the *material conditions* of mind.

As Mr. Lewes remarks, friendly as he is to, and ranking as he does with, these psychologists, "no amount of ingenuity will make an '*impression*' transmitted along a nerve, either by mechanical '*vibrations*,' or by fluids of the most mysterious quality, explain the nature of *perception*, which remains the essential fact and eternal mystery."



We are obliged to breathe from our own consciousness that meaning *into* the phenomena which the sensational psychologist seeks to draw *from* them. No process of evolution we can imagine, that is legitimate, is sufficient to give us at its conclusion, movements at first *involuntary* at last as *voluntary*.

Prof. Bain fails, to our minds, to show with certainty *when* or *how* this capital change occurs, from the involuntary to the voluntary.

The whole metamorphosis, as remarked above, is made to take place in that indefinite period which terminates in early infancy. No process we can devise can transform *passive sense* into *self-active mental power*. Nor can the contemplation of the organic conditions of mind, however perfectly known, so far as we can see, teach us *anything* concerning the *intrinsic nature* of mind, unless we make mind an attribute of matter.

The truth is, proceeding in this manner from Physiology to Psychology, we cannot explain the phenomena of mind unless we introduce *new elements*, new "primitive germs," either avowedly or inadvertently. The latter is really done by Prof. Bain, and the entire class of psychologists to which he belongs. To show in what instances this is done would fall outside of our present design. We have confined our attention thus far to the border lines between the two sciences, and have endeavored to ascend from the domain of Physiology, with the best aid it seemed to afford, to that of Psychology, and have been baffled in each attempt to find a logical connection between the distinctive objects of either. A further examination would reveal in a still more striking manner the want of logical conformity between the superstructure and its assumed foundation. The difficulties revealed in the first steps are far from disappearing in succeeding ones. We should be glad to follow on, and find in what manner he accounts for our belief in substance and an external world. He says characteristically in relation to these, that "the conjoint experience of the senses and the movements appear to me to furnish all that we possess in the notion of extended matter," and "that our perceptions and knowledge of the material world come through the muscular feelings, and the sensations by their association with one another." Also, how he obtains our knowledge of *space*, of which he says, "the mental conception that we have of

empty space is scope for movement," or how he obtains and accounts for our notions of cause, of time, or the postulates of exact science, our ideas of proportion, unity, beauty, goodness, and right, and the sentiments or emotions, faith, love, etc. In almost every instance there is much to which we object, copious as are his resources, and skillful as he is in employing them. When, in his second volume, he attempts to exhibit the genesis and composition of our highest faculties, emotions, and beliefs, he seems not only to fail, but partly because of imperfect appreciation of the phenomena he seeks to account for.

But can Physiology really render *no* service to Psychology? We answer, it can.

In relation to some of the border phenomena, as sensation, habit, and the like, it can afford indispensable assistance.

In regard to sensation, for example, part of the truth is with the psychologist, and only part; the remainder is with the physiologist.

Much of the confusion which has prevailed, and *still* prevails, in relation to this term, is due to the fact that it has generally been discussed on purely psychological or physiological grounds; when the true state of the case is, *each* must contribute to the solution of questions which emerge on this field.

To show articulately the instances, and manner in each case, in which Physiology could render efficient aid to Psychology, would exceed our present limits. It can give important aid in determining what are the *organic conditions* of correct or healthy mental action, and in determining the *parts* of the nervous system devoted apparently to particular offices, such as *automatic* or reflex actions, special senses, consciousness, intellection, and the like. Physiology concerns itself with the organism which conveys messages as it were *to* and *from* between the objective and subjective worlds, and *through* which they are enabled, as it were, to commune. This is a high and worthy task, and one to which the physiologist *as such* would do well to confine himself. We are jealous of the interests of Physiology, and our admiration for what it has accomplished is deep and sincere: but it rests on other grounds than those of its achievements, real or pretended, actual or prospective, in behalf of Psychology.

In looking at the *organism* with which mind is so myste-

riously connected on the one hand, and *mind* itself on the other, we would no more make the mind depend exclusively on the brain and nervous system than we would the brain and nervous system on the mind. The state of the body or brain may and does affect the mind; but we must make the relation reciprocal, and complete the statement by saying the state of the mind may affect the brain or body. While we admire and prize the additions to scientific knowledge, and our stock of scientific conceptions, made by the modern "scientific school," of which M. Comte may be justly regarded as the founder, we, however, are by no means willing to abolish the distinction between the "mental and moral sciences" and the "physical," and instead of crystallizing our knowledges around two grand axes as we seem entitled to do, to group them around *one*, and that one *material*, virtually reducing mind to an attribute of matter, and leading as a logical result to a gross and debasing Materialism.

---

### ART. III.—HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

*History of the Church of Christ, in Chronological Tables.* By HENRY B. SMITH, D.D. New York: Scribner & Co. 1859.

*The History of Christianity from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire.* By HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's. A new and revised edition in three volumes. New York: Widdleton. 1866.

*History of Latin Christianity; including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicolas V.* By HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D. In eight volumes. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1860.

*History of the Christian Church.* By PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D. Vol. I. From the Birth of Christ to the Reign of Constantine. Vols. II, III. From Constantine the Great to Gregory the Great. New York: Scribner & Co. 1839-1867.

HISTORY is a progressive science. Its most important principles can only be deduced from accumulated examples. Correct judgments of events can only mature in the light of time. These affirmations are no more true of secular than of ecclesiastical history. Indeed, no branch of history has been more tardily brought to a reasonable degree of perfection than that relating to the Christian Church.

Following the inspired record, the earlier works on this subject were not only fragmentary, but in most cases debased by

superstitious credulity. It is painful to observe how early the annals of the Church suffered from this cause, and to what an extent the authority of many venerated names is really weakened by it. During that dismal millennium extending from the sixth to the sixteenth century, the mingled tide of superstition and corruption continued to flow in upon the Church without ebbing. As a consequence, true progress was checked, literature declined, and there were few in the Church competent to the task of justly delineating the events that transpired. With the introduction of hierarchical schemes and pretensions there seemed to arise the necessity of historical forgeries in the form of pseudo apostolical constitutions and decretals which, under high ecclesiastical sanction, were made to usurp the place of true records, or were so intermingled with authentic narratives as to make detection for many centuries difficult if not impossible. Nevertheless, as time rolled on material for future historians was constantly accumulating and awaiting the dawn of better days for its thorough study and its proper treatment.

As a means of forming a just estimate of the works named at the head of this article, we propose to reach them in chronological order in the course of a brief sketch of the literature of Church History. This course seems the more proper from the fact that many readers are not well aware of the steps by which Church History has been brought to its present position, or of the character and relative value of existing works on the subject.

The beginnings of uninspired Church history were written in the Greek language. Eusebius, bishop of Cesarea in Palestine, is often called the "father of ecclesiastical history;" more from his position as the first of the ancient historians, and from the relative importance of anything covering the period of which he wrote, A. D. 1-306, than from the intrinsic merit of his work. The succession of Greek writers from the period of the Nicene Council to the beginning of the seventh century was very direct. A list of the most important, with their leading characteristics and the periods of their history, may be embraced in a few lines. Fragmentary works, like that of Hegesippus, A. D. 170, and the chronicle of Julius Africanus, A. D. 295, will be omitted.

Socrates, a native of Constantinople, and an advocate by profession, wrote in continuation of Eusebius, A. D. 306-439. In capacity as a historian he excelled his predecessor. His statements are more definite, his descriptions more graphic, and his candor and impartiality at least equal.

Sozomen, a native of Palestine, also an advocate of Constantinople, wrote, like Socrates, in continuation of Eusebius, A. D. 324-423. He is said to have been converted by a miracle of the Palestinian monk Hilarion, and he gives the largest credence to the monastic exaggerations of the times. His narration indicates less of ability and discrimination than that of Socrates. Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus in Mesopotamia, wrote in reference to nearly the same period as Sozomen, A. D. 322-427. His literary merits are equal to those of either of his contemporaries, and he treats on various topics omitted by them. Different opinions have prevailed as to the relations these authors sustained to each other. Some have supposed that Sozomen wrote to supplement Socrates and Theodoret—to supplement the labors of both his predecessors. The best opinion, however, seems to be that the three works were produced independently of each other, and that all together present but too meager a treatment of the period to which they relate.

To the names of these principal writers may be added that of Philostorgius, the Arian, A. D. 318-425, whose work is only known by an epitome, compiled for the purpose of refutation by Photius, bishop of Constantinople, about the middle of the ninth century, and that of Evagrius, an advocate of Antioch, A. D. 431-594. The latter may be regarded as a continuation of the history by Theodoret, and is specially important as covering a period not reached by the preceding works.

None of these writers affect to be philosophical, or expend any words in tracing events to their causes. They all pursue a simple paragraphical method, paying but little regard to the connection of topics. Nevertheless, they give evidence of having carefully sought out the best materials, by consulting, and often copying, the letters of emperors and bishops, the proceedings of councils, and other public and private sources of information. They seem to have given the result of their

inquiries with fairness and integrity, according to their conception of things. If we note their credulity and superstitious admiration of monastic austerities, we must concede that these were faults of their time, and we cannot complain that their works illustrate the spirit of the age in which they were written.

The works thus far named have always constituted, and must always remain, the principal authorities for the period to which they relate. They are now accessible in good English translations, published in Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library. They have attractions for the curious reader and the advanced student, but do not claim the attention of beginners.

In Latin, besides Jerome's meager catalogue of illustrious men and ancient authors, the only Church Histories of the patristic period were translations from the Greek authors named. The *Historia Tripartita*, compiled from Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret by the monk Cassiodorus about A. D. 560, was the principal book on ecclesiastical history circulated in the Latin Church down to the period of the Reformation. Nevertheless, during that long interval, barren of all history worthy of the name, masses of material were accumulated for the elaboration of future historians. This material consisted of the acts of councils, records of the papal court, monographs of monastic orders, creeds, confessions, catechisms, liturgies, and a vast amount of ecclesiastical matter mingled with the records of civil governments.

The Reformation roused the intellect of the world, and being contemporaneous with the common use of the art of printing, stimulated the production and study of Church History to an extent unknown before. To Matthias Flacius Illyricus, and several Lutheran divines associated with him, belongs the credit of the first truly great work on the History of the Christian Church. He arose in the second generation of the Protestant divines, and maintained with boldness and partisan zeal the extreme consequences of the doctrines of Luther. Moved by the constant taunt of Romanists, that the Protestant doctrines were unknown before the time of Luther, he determined to exhibit to the world the opinions which had been expressed by learned and pious men before the Reformation. He accordingly published in 1556 his *Catalogue of Witnesses*. But this



was only introductory to his history known as the *Magdeburg Centuries*. This work was written in Latin, and published in large folios, a volume for each century. The task of preparing and issuing such a work at that time was Herculean, and could only have been accomplished by the utmost energy and perseverance. With limited means, but with iron will, Flacius associated with himself able coadjutors, and fearlessly encountered not only the opposition of Rome, but the jealousy and contempt of a powerful party among the Protestants of Germany. He ransacked libraries to procure books and manuscripts. He secured the pecuniary assistance of wealthy friends, and raised a fund to which even kings and cities contributed to aid in the accomplishment of his purpose. With all the co-operation that could be secured, many years were occupied in the publication of the book. The first volume appeared in 1559, and successive volumes in years following, up to 1574, when the labors of the original authors terminated with the thirteenth century. The work was continued by Lucas Osiander in nine quarto volumes, published A. D. 1592-1604. This was in every respect an extraordinary production. It was written upon a grand scale. It brought to light quantities of unpublished documents, and gave the subject of ecclesiastical history at once a thoroughly scientific arrangement, which, notwithstanding objections to the formality of its classification, has never ceased to be influential upon subsequent writers.

Although the *Magdeburg Centuries* were unwieldy, and quite unadapted to popular use, they became a grand source of material for public discussion, and for the preparation of smaller books for a hundred years following. They also accomplished the important object of calling out the Roman Church in reply. Several of its most learned writers attacked the work of the centuriators and sought to expose its faults. But they found that a new engine had been introduced into religious warfare, and that they fought at a disadvantage till they had produced something of the same character. The first attempt on a large scale was that of Panvinus, one of the most learned Italians of his day; but he died in 1568, having collected two large volumes of *Annalium Ecclesiasticorum*.

The elaboration and completion of this work was committed

to Cæsar Baronius, a Neapolitan of great literary ability. Encouraged by the highest papal influence, and furnished with all needed help, he toiled upon it thirty years, thereby winning to himself the dignity of a cardinal, and narrowly escaping an election to the Papacy. Yet Baronius only lived to complete twelve folio volumes, which were printed at Rome 1588-1607. His folios, like those of Flacius, covered a century each. Having been compiled from the papal archives, from conventual libraries, and from various sources not accessible to Protestants, this work had a value peculiar to itself, even in the estimation of those against whom it was aimed. This estimation would have been much higher had not the work been marred by fictitious narratives, spurious documents, corrupted records, and the suppression of all material unfavorable to its objects. Although Baronius prudently avoided direct reference to the Magdeburg Centuries, except to call them centuries of Satan, yet his Annals have always been regarded as an attempted response to the matter they contained. The Annals equaled the Centuries in the spirit of controversy, and were in after years abridged, popularized, and translated into various languages by the partisans of the Church of Rome. The continuators of Baronius were Bzovius, Spondanus, and Raynaldus, who successively brought the Annals down to 1640.

By the great works named the field of ecclesiastical history was broadly opened, and ground was taken upon both sides of all the great questions at issue between Rome and Protestantism. But a long period followed before any other work of great ability appeared relating to the general subject. If the theme was not supposed to be exhausted, its magnitude was at least made obvious, and the hazard on either side of encountering comparison with authorship of so great ability was not likely to be coveted. Besides, the times were agitated, and unfavorable to historic composition. Polemics were in the ascendant, and religious questions were arbitrated by the sword as well as by the pen. It was not till the latter part of the seventeenth century that any considerable degree of attention was given to ecclesiastical history. Since that period, this, like other branches of literature, has received its principal development. As modern Church History took its rise from the Reformation, so it has received its chief contributions from countries

influenced by the Reformation. In every species of discussion and treatment of the subject Germany has taken the lead, while France and England have followed next in order.

In respect to the character of its books on Church History Germany has been a house divided against itself, in which Protestant Orthodoxy, Romanism, and Neology have been contending with each other in a strife long and earnest, but in which the former has gained an obvious, and it may be hoped a permanent, ascendancy.

The most celebrated French works on Church History have been Romanistic, although several valuable treatises in that language have been produced by Protestants. The recent work of De Pressensé on the first three centuries takes a high rank from the beginning.

In England, authorship on this subject has been almost uniformly Protestant, and with almost as great a uniformity representing the views of the Established Church.

America, up to this time, with a few exceptions, has been obliged to content itself with reprints and translations. Even the work of Dr. Schaff, although originating in the United States, is composed and published in German, being simultaneously rendered into English for publication here.

Without further consecutive notice of Ecclesiastical Historiography, attention will now be directed to its more important results as existing in the English language, and more especially as available at the present time to American students. It will assist a ready comprehension of the subject to remark that books on ecclesiastical history may be distributed into three principal classes, namely: 1. Monographs, or treatises on special topics or periods. 2. Manuals, or compendiums. 3. Systematic works, designed to cover the entire subject in detail. Contrary to the preconceptions of many, these different classes of books are severally important to a student, and, in fact, essential to each other. In the conviction that the best mode of using books on Ecclesiastical History is not so generally understood as it ought to be, and that, consequently, the subject is unduly neglected by some, while much time is wasted upon it by others, we will explain briefly the proper design of the several classes of books named.

Monographs are first in the order of production. In fact, no systematic history can be written without a great number of special treatises as a basis. But when written, systematic works do not render unnecessary the further production of special treatises, as individuals have favorable opportunities and proper motives for elaborating particular topics in greater detail than can be allowed in systematic histories.

Manuals are last in the order of production, and yet a first necessity of students. Their design should be to give a just and well-proportioned outline of the whole subject. No person is prepared to read Ecclesiastical History with profit until he has such an outline clearly imprinted upon his mind. For lack of such a preliminary outline many readers become lost or confused in the mass of matter furnished by systematic books; while many others, from reading only or chiefly detached monographs, form at best but fragmentary ideas of the subject as a whole. When, however, a proper outline has been duly impressed upon the mind the student is prepared to fill it up, either as a whole or in parts, by detailed reading in consecutive order, or by topics in which, from time to time, he may be specially interested.

Some of the most valuable of the productions of English writers in this department of literature belong to the class of monographs, and it is remarkable that no treatises of more recent date have surpassed in merit the early books of such men as Cave, Bingham, and Lardner. To the two former, Dr. Schaff in the preface to his second volume pays a handsome tribute in connection with other great names in ecclesiastical history.

Dr. Cave was an eminent clergyman of the Church of England, occupying various important positions in London between the years 1662 and 1713. His principal works are the following: *Primitive Christianity, or the Religion of the Ancient Christians*. *Lives of the Apostles and Fathers of the Primitive Church*. *Historia Literaria of Ecclesiastical Writers, from the Birth of Christ to the Fourteenth Century*, with an Appendix by another hand, reaching to 1517. The last is the most valuable of all his works. It is now rare, and a reprint in convenient form is a desideratum. Cave's "*Dissertation concerning the Government of the Ancient Church by Bishops*,

Metropolitans, and Patriarchs," although strongly anti-papal, proves his Churchmanship to have been of the highest type. His "Serious Exhortation relative to Dissenters," and his "Discourse on the Unity of the Catholic Church maintained in the Church of England," are of a similar character.

Joseph Bingham, educated at the University of Oxford, was subsequently rector of a small English Church in Hampshire. In 1708 he published the first volume of his *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, and the tenth and last in 1722. This work not only secured a high reputation in England, but was so much prized on the continent of Europe as to have been translated into Latin, and published at Halle in 1724-9, and again in 1751. Many editions have appeared in England. The cheapest and most convenient is that published by Bohn, in two volumes octavo. That which is probably the most valuable is an edition in eight volumes, revised by the great great grandson of the author, one hundred and thirty years after the death of his ancestor.

In connection with the works already named, mention is due to "The Credibility of the Gospel History, or the Principal Facts of the New Testament, confirmed by Passages of Ancient Authors, who were Contemporary with our Saviour or his Apostles, or Lived near their Time," by Nathaniel Lardner, D.D. In its modern and most condensed form this work fills eight octavo volumes. Its title, although diffuse, conveys no adequate idea of its value in a historical point of view. Indeed, it has been rarely referred to, except as a work on the evidences of Christianity, and yet it is practically a thesaurus of immense convenience and great value for students in Ecclesiastical History, especially for all who have not access to full sets of those ancient books, which with the lapse of time are growing more and more rare. Although wrought out in reference to his primary object, the confirmation of the New Testament record, the author's plan embraced the history of Christian authors from Barnabas, A. D. 71, to Nicephorus Callisti, 1325, and also copious extracts from their various works. To these he added similar sketches and extracts of heathen authors, from Pliny the Elder, A. D. 77, to Simplicius, A.D. 550. To all the foregoing he added a collection of Jewish testimonies, and a very complete history of heretics. Lardner's

works, in ten volumes, containing the matter referred to, are happily not rare at the present time.

In the department of Manuals of Church History, there has been very little independent authorship in the English language, although of abridgments, translations, and compilations the name is legion. Of this class of books there are two kinds; one in the narrative form, and the other in the elliptical style of annals and chronological summaries.

The narrative style is represented by Dr. George Gregory's "*Concise History of the Christian Church.*" This work was pronounced by Johnson Grant "an excellent abridgment of Mosheim." Actual comparison, however, proves it to be much more; that is, to have been rewritten not only from Mosheim, but from other sources, although modeled on the plan of Mosheim. First published in London 1788-90, it was republished in the United States in 1834, under the editorship of Dr. Martin Ruter, by whose name it is more generally known in this country.

The manuals of the German authors Hase and Kurtz have been translated and published in America. Both exhibit all the advantages of modern arrangement and scholarship, but have other defects, which render them ill adapted to the use of American students. Like all books of Teutonic origin, they give a disproportionate space to German affairs, and in their attempts at comprehensive generalization they often become vague and obscure. Besides, neither their style nor their mode of thought is well adapted to the American mind. Kurtz, a Lutheran, may be considered evangelical; but Hase is offensively rationalistic.

Of the other style of manual two may be named, one English and one American. The first is entitled "*Ecclesiastical Chronology, or Annals of the Christian Church from its Foundation to the Present Time, containing a view of General Church History, and the Course of Secular Events; the Limits of the Church, and its Relation to the State; Controversies, Sects and Parties, Rites, Institutions, Discipline; Ecclesiastical Writers.*" The whole arranged according to the Order of Dates, and divided into Seven Periods. To which are added, Lists of Councils and of Popes, Patriarchs, and Archbishops of Canterbury. By the Rev. J. E. Riddle, M.A., author of a



Manual of Christian Antiquities, etc." This book was published in London in 1840, and possesses no inconsiderable merit, but not being accessible to most of our readers, does not demand more extensive notice.

The title of the other work alluded to in this connection is given at the head of the present article. It has been prepared with the diligence of a laborious scholar, and the tact of a practical teacher, upon the basis of the best German works of the same character. Its excellences, and the advantages of its intelligent use, are almost innumerable; but its awkward and inconvenient form is greatly to be regretted. In one particular it is superior to all other manuals known, it does proportionate justice to American Church History by allotting two full tables to an exhibit of its principal facts, and yet it seems to apologize for the introduction of these tables by calling them *supplementary*, as though America were an irregular addendum both to the world and the Church. The first table relates to the period between 1492 and 1776, in which the Church was propagated by colonization; the second to that from 1776 to 1858, in which the voluntary principle became established in the Church, and the dissent of the old world became predominant in the new.

The value of Dr. Smith's tables is augmented by a minute index, making references easy, and would have been still further increased by the addition of blank pages and columns in which students could note additional facts of importance as they occur. A generous addition of blank interleaves would be a great convenience and advantage to such students as might wish to note further references to authors, or extend their own reflections and observations upon historic events, and also greatly improve the gauntiness of Dr. Smith's meager folio.

Systematic treatises covering the whole period of ecclesiastical history are the ambition of professed historians. Few, however, have lived to complete them. The subject is long, and life is short. Nevertheless, Claude Fleury completed his twentieth volume quarto, and the German Schröckh his forty-third volume octavo! Happily for readers, no English writer or even translator has spread himself out so interminably. Neander's history, of which we have a translation, including his Life of Christ in six volumes 8vo., falls one hundred years

short of the goal at which he had aimed, and only reaches to 1415.

Joseph Milner began at the Pentecost, but death overtook him when he had barely reached the period of the Reformation. The edition of his history most circulated in this country is supplemented by a continuation taken from the history of Dr. Haweis, to the end of the eighteenth century.

Milman began his "History of Christianity to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire" with the incarnation, and his Latin Christianity comes down to 1454, within sixty-three years of the period of the Reformation.

Schaff, at the end of twenty years' public labor in America, has produced four octavo volumes and reached A. D. 600.

To the works of the two living historians last named our further remarks must be limited. Dr. Milman, now and for a long period the Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, commenced his public literary career as a poet in 1815. In 1829 he published a history of the Jews. His "History of Christianity, from the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire," saw the light in 1840. It was well received from the first, and recently a new edition has been issued and revised throughout by the hand of the author. In that work no definite promise of continuance was given, and for a period of fourteen years it was only entitled to be considered a monograph upon the first four centuries of the Church. As such it was well proportioned, and rounded up with a completeness not excelled in any similar work, at least of an equally popular character.

In 1854 Milman's "History of Latin Christianity" began to appear. That was definitely announced as a continuation of the former work, and in 1857 was brought to a completion. The American edition appeared in 1860, in a style of typography highly creditable to the publishers. The plan of the work may be briefly indicated.

Dr. Milman recognizes Christianity antecedent to the fifth century as essentially Grecian.

Its primal records were all, or nearly all, written in the Greek language; it was promulgated with the greatest rapidity and success among nations either of Greek descent or those which had been Grecized by the conquests of Alexander; its most flourishing

Churches were in Greek cities. Greek was the commercial language in which the Jews, through whom it was at first disseminated, and who were even now settled in almost every province of the Roman world, carried on their intercourse.

But at the extinction of Paganism, Greek or Eastern Christianity had almost ceased to be aggressive or creative.

Latin Christianity, on the other hand, seemed endowed with an inexhaustible principle of expanding life. No sooner had the Northern tribes entered within its magic circle than they submitted to its yoke, and not content with thus conquering its conquerors, it was constantly pushing forward its own frontier and advancing into the strongholds of Northern Paganism. Gradually it became a monarchy, with all the power of a concentrated dominion. The clergy assumed an absolute despotism over the mind of man: not satisfied with ruling princes and kings, themselves became princes and kings.

Their organization was coincident with the bounds of Christendom. They were a second universal magistracy, exercising always equal, and asserting, and for a long period possessing, superior power to the civil government. They had their own jurisprudence—the canon law—co-ordinate with, and of equal authority with, the Roman or the various national codes, only with penalties infinitely more terrific, almost arbitrarily administered, and admitting no exception, not even that of the greatest temporal sovereign.

Western monasticism, in its general character, was not the barren, idly laborious, or dreamy quietude of the East. It was industrious and productive. It settled colonies, preserved arts and letters, built splendid edifices, fertilized deserts. If it rent from the world the most powerful minds, having trained them by its stern discipline, it sent them back to rule the world. It continually, as it were, renewed its youth, and kept up a constant infusion of vigorous life, now quickening into enthusiasm, now darkening into fanaticism, and by its perpetual rivalry stimulating the zeal or supplying the deficiencies of the secular clergy. In successive ages it adapted itself to the state of the human mind. At first a missionary to barbarous nations, it built abbeys, hewed down forests, cultivated swamps, inclosed domains, retrieved or won for civilization tracts which had fallen to waste or had never known culture. With St. Dominic, it turned its missionary zeal upon Christianity itself, and spread as a preaching order throughout Christendom; with St. Francis, it became even more popular, and lowered itself to the very humblest of mankind. In Jesuitism it made a last effort to govern mankind by an incorporated caste. But Jesuitism found it necessary to reject many of the peculiarities of monasticism; it made itself secular to overcome the world. But the compromise could not endure. Over the Indians of South America alone, but for the force of circumstances, it might have been lasting. In Eastern India it became a kind of Christian Paganism, in Europe

a moral and religious Rationalism, fatal both to morals and to religion.

Throughout this period, then, of at least ten centuries, Latin Christianity was the religion of the Western nations of Europe. Latin the religious language, the Latin translations of the Scriptures the religious code of mankind. Latin theology was alone inexhaustibly prolific and held wide and unshaken authority.

Thus has Dr. Milman described the subject of the second great division of his historical labors, to which he somewhat arbitrarily finds a limit at the end of the pontificate of Nicolas V. in 1454. He intimates his reasons for determining that in Nicolas V. closed one great age of the papacy in the following terms:

Before long the pontiff was to be lost in the Sovereign Prince. Nor was it less evident that the exclusive dominion of Latin Christianity was drawing to a close, though nearly a century might elapse before the final secession of Teutonic Christianity and the great permanent division of Christendom.

Logically one might say, that having noted the rise and culmination of Latin Christianity, he ought to have sketched its decline, or at the very least, to have brought its history down to the period when its corruptions provoked the origin of that Protestantism which our author has chosen to designate as Teutonic Christianity.

In 1845 Milman, then Prebendary of St. Peter's, and Rector of St. Margaret's, Westminster, edited and annotated an edition of Gibbon's *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. A reader of that work, in comparison with Milman's histories, will not find it difficult to trace resemblances in the style of the two authors, though he may be at a loss to decide which excels in the clearness of his portraitures and the stately elegance of his periods.

Milman's works are adapted to readers rather than students; and certainly the author has succeeded in investing them with a charm of narrative and a beauty of diction quite superior to that of any other writer of Ecclesiastical History in our language. Indeed, one can hardly avoid the impression that he occasionally, though unintentionally, sacrifices the stern fidelity of a historian in his fondness for exhibiting a splendid subject, and in his tendency to magnify characters and events in correspondence with his own ideal. Yet Milman is no parti-

san. His candor is uniform, and his broad catholicity is in the happiest contrast with the narrow bigotry so characteristic of many writers of the Church he represents.

Dr. Schaff is the first American who has made any considerable progress in the production of a systematic History of the Christian Church. It will be observed that we are disposed to consider him as much an American as if he had been native born. His citizenship among us is that of intelligent choice, and therefore of the highest merit.

So far as we are aware, his first work published in the United States was a thin duodecimo, bearing the following title: "What is Church History? A Vindication of the Idea of Historical Development. By PHILIP SCHAF. Philadelphia. 1846." The more important ideas of this preliminary work, in a somewhat modified and improved form, were embodied in the "General Introduction to Church History," which constitutes the first part of his "History of the Apostolic Church," published in 1853. On the title-page of that fine volume of six hundred and eighty-three pages, octavo, the author's name had taken on an extra f, which it has since retained. In the preface he announced his plan of a general Church History, to be completed down "to the present time," in about nine moderate volumes. In 1859 the first volume of the proposed "History of the Christian Church, by Philip Schaff, D. D." made its appearance. The first one hundred and forty pages were occupied with a condensation of the preceding work, and the additional matter came down to the edict of Constantine, A. D. 311.

Of the personal history of the author up to that time the following account was published, also in 1859, by Samuel M. Smucker, LL.D., in a work entitled "A History of all Religions," article "German Reformed Church:—"

In the year 1844 the General Synod of the German Reformed Church resolved to send to Germany to procure the services of a German professor for their seminary at Mercersburg, who would be better qualified than any of their native ministers to teach theology to their candidates for the clerical office. After some investigation they selected Dr. Philip Schaff, at that time an under teacher, or *professor extraordinarius*, of theology in the University of Berlin, who had acquired some reputation as a scholar and a man of ambitious energy, who seemed to possess peculiar



qualifications for the vacant place. He accepted the invitation, removed to this country, and at once began to perform the duties of his office. Dr. Schaff is unquestionably a man of superior learning and ability; and the activity in elaborating ponderous books in the department of Church history, which he has since displayed, may well excite the astonishment and despair of American authors and scholars. His associate at Mercersburg was Dr. John W. Nevin, formerly a clergyman of the Old School Presbyterian Church. Dr. Schaff brought with him to this country all his peculiar views in theology, which may be characterized as being strongly conservative, in opposition to every thing like progress or freedom. His opinions are, in fact, very much like the Puseyite school in the Episcopal Church; having great reverence for the Romish Church, and entertaining very intense admiration for the usages and institutions of the Middle Ages, which he is horrified to hear ignorant people in this country call the "Dark Ages." No sooner had Dr. Nevin been brought within his influence than he became a violent convert to Dr. Schaff's opinions, and the pair commenced the work of revolutionizing the whole system of belief and Church usage, which till then prevailed in the German Reformed denomination in this country.

Prominent among the antique novelties introduced by them was a singular and most preposterous theory in regard to the Lord's supper . . . to the effect that in the sacrament of the supper the glorified humanity of Christ, his body, bones, and blood, are actually present; that they are mysteriously united with the consecrated emblems; and that they thereby become virtually and actually united with and received by the worthy communicant. . . .

Few of the ministers of the sect could fully comprehend what these learned doctors meant; but as such able men assured them that that was the doctrine both of Calvin and the Scriptures, they concluded that it must be so, and inferred that all was right. Accordingly, the several synods adopted resolutions approving of this doctrine, and at the same time indorsing several other theological crotchets, old time fossil, medieval conceits about the Church and the ministry, which Dr. Schaff had imbibed when a student at the University of Tübingen. The result was that the new system introduced into the German Reformed Church in this country has destroyed much of the vitality which it had previously possessed.

It is not to be denied that the earlier views expressed by Dr. Schaff on the points above referred to, and some others, caused his historical works for a time to be regarded with distrust by some and indifference by others. But the ease with which he held them in abeyance, the mildness with which he stated them, and the gracefulness with which he laid



them aside in the progress of his own "development" as a historian, has caused those sentiments in a great measure to disappear.

As the first volume of his "Church History" became known and appreciated, the desire among scholars and teachers became general that the subsequent volumes might appear rapidly. At the end of eight years a simultaneous issue was made of the second and third volumes, covering the second period of the History, according to our author's plan of division. At this rate of progress we may expect the completion of his ninth period fifty-six years from the present time, or A.D. 1923! If the successive periods grow on his hands as the second one has done, we may also expect seventeen volumes instead of nine. To such as may have the leisure to wait and read them, we presume all these volumes will seem only too short. But we venture to suggest that without more dispatch both author and expectant readers are in danger of being disappointed of the desired result. It is not too much to say that the author, in view of the importance of the work he has so ably commenced, and for the completion of which he has made such scholarly preparations, should not allow himself to be diverted to other objects as he has been for the last few years. Before him lies the alternative of leaving to the world an introductory sketch relating to those periods of Church History already most written upon, or a systematic treatise on the whole subject. Let him, therefore, cultivate his chosen field in which his labors have become a desideratum acknowledged by all. By so doing, and by all necessary aid, making sure of bringing down his work to the present time, he has an opportunity of fame and of usefulness rarely enjoyed by a literary man.

Dr. Schaff's "History of the Christian Church" not only represents the most recent, but the best German scholarship, and that improved by his contact with men and things in the new world. While his idea of the task of a historian is an exalted one, he never loses sight of his obligations as an instructor. By lucid arrangement, systematic subdivisions, and ample references to the literature of successive topics, he constantly ministers to the convenience of students. His sketches of the fathers and other prominent characters of Church

history are unusually vivid. His delineations of doctrinal opinions are clear and satisfactory, although on some topics unnecessarily detailed for a general history.

It is not difficult to find in Dr. Schaff's pages expressions and opinions which challenge adverse criticism. The following instances may be cited as examples:

In vol. i, page 61, the author calls the day of Pentecost the "birthday of the Christian Church," and credits Peter with "the first Christian sermon;" as though Christ, "the head," had not introduced, founded, and established his own Church, in which he called Peter to be an apostle, and as though the great Teacher had never preached a sermon, not even that on the mount!

In vol. ii, page 5, he credits the hermitage and the cloister with "some of the noblest heroes of Christian holiness!"

On page 149 of the same volume he says, monasticism "still remains in the Greek and Roman Churches an *indispensable institution*, and the most productive seminary of *saints*, *priests*, and *missionaries*!"

On page 542, vol. iii, he says, "The period of church building properly begins with Constantine the Great. There was probably more building of this kind in the fourth century than there has been in any period since, excepting, perhaps, the nineteenth century, in the United States, where every *ten* years hundreds of churches and chapels are erected!"

On page 1024, vol. iii, stands the following very unhistorical, but apparently oracular statement: "He who would give others the conviction that he has a divine vocation for the Church and for mankind, must himself be penetrated with the faith of an *eternal, unalterable decree* of God, and must cling to it in the darkest hours!"

While we regret that such expressions and opinions have been allowed to mar a work combining so many excellences, we can nevertheless afford to overlook them on the score of carelessness in revision, or possibly weakness of judgment, and not, on account of them, to withhold our commendation of a book of such a high grade of merit, and of which we anxiously desire to see the completion.

Had we space we would gladly copy numerous passages which may be instanced as fine examples of the best style and

quality of historic composition. But we must content ourselves with suggesting to the reader the higher pleasure and advantage of reading them in their proper connections, and duly weighing them in the course of a thorough study of the entire work.

---

#### ART. IV.—PHYSICAL CAUSE OF THE DEATH OF CHRIST.

FROM the frequent allusions of some of our most able and popular ministers, in sermons and essays, to the physical or proximate cause of the death of Christ, and from the manner in which they treat the subject, we are led to the conclusion that they have adopted a certain theory upon this point which was promulgated some years ago by an eminent professional gentleman of England, Dr. Stroud, and afterward presented to the public in this country through two of our leading religious journals, namely, the April number, 1849, of the "Methodist Quarterly Review," and the "Ladies' Repository" of May, 1855.

In that excellent and popular commentary on the Gospels, by Rev. D. D. Whedon, D.D., we find Dr. Stroud's opinions on this subject referred to with decided approval. Commenting on John xix, 34, the author says: "Of all the natural solutions, perhaps that of Stroud is the best. He maintains that Jesus died of a broken heart, and in such a case blood would escape into the region around the heart, and there be separated into clot and watery fluid; thence it would escape through the wound made by the spear." These opinions, put forth by Dr. Stroud and his followers, while confined to the religious literature of London, or even England, might pass unnoticed by us; but when indorsed by some of our best writers, and finally by almost every minister who alludes to the subject, in our American pulpits, it becomes a duty to inquire whether those opinions will stand the test in the light of science and divinity.

Two theories of the proximate cause of the death of Christ, have been spoken of as current:

First, that the Saviour of men, by his own divine will, yielded up his life; and second, that some mortal lesion of some vital organ of his human body suddenly supervened, and caused or necessitated death.

Rejecting the former theory, which is the one, we believe, heretofore almost universally received, and adopting the latter, these writers go on to fortify the position assumed by facts drawn from pathological anatomy. These we will notice briefly first, and afterward show the impossibility of this theory, from undisputed anatomical and pathological authority.

The fact is *assumed* by these writers that the vital organ that suffered lesion was the heart; and cases and fact are furnished, from diseased bodies, which are supposed to be analogous, such as these:

Bennett gives an account of a soldier who died suddenly after a long-continued grief. While all the other viscera were healthy, the pericardium was found to contain not only water, but much coagulated blood. Dr. Thurman mentions a case of rupture of the heart, in which the pericardium was found to contain several ounces of coagulated blood and serum. Dr. Townsend, of New York, mentions a case of an unfortunate female in that city who literally and truly died of a broken heart. In the post-mortem examination, the pericardium being penetrated, a pint, at least, of transparent serum issued out, leaving crassamentum firmly attached to the inner surface of the heart.

Similar cases might be multiplied without number; but it needs but very few words to show their utter inapplicability to the case of the Saviour's death.

The fluids exhibited upon post-mortem examination in the above cases were the results of long-continued diseases and previous morbid conditions of the system. Under such circumstances in chronic disease of the heart, after many months or years of suffering, the pericardium may be put upon the stretch by dropsical effusion until the motions of the heart become embarrassed, and under the weight of the fluid mass cease to beat. But surely no man, understanding this subject, will assert that our Lord came to the cross with a diseased heart. The cases quoted, therefore, cannot apply to him.

The main object of these writers seems to be to explain the

words of John xix, 34, "But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came thereout blood and water;" and the theory seems to have been adopted to account on natural principles for this water and blood. And here two things must be assumed: First, that the heart had been ruptured; and second, that the soldier's spear actually entered and penetrated the pericardium. These assumptions have not a shadow of support, as we shall soon demonstrate.

An opinion, to illustrate the pathology of the case, is introduced from Dr. Paget in the following words: "The crassamentum and serum of the blood never separate while circulating in the natural vessels." The natural blood-vessels are the heart and arteries and veins and capillaries. After death the heart and arteries are generally found empty, so that the blood retires into the veins and capillaries, mostly into the latter, and is therefore not a subject of post-mortem inquiry. Again, Dr. Paget's statement is not a fact of universal application, because it is well known that in some diseased conditions, as in typhus and cholera, the serum separates from the crassamentum while the blood is still languidly circulating in the natural vessels.

The suddenness of the death of Christ is offered as a reason for supposing the rupture of the heart. But the intensity of his previous sufferings in the garden will account sufficiently for the sudden dissolution of the body of Jesus under the agony of crucifixion; and that other more important fact, that he was active and not passive in the matter, and hence chose his own time to end the agony. This we learn from his own words, John x, 17, 18, "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself." At the point where his sufferings were complete, when he had drank the cup to the dregs he yielded up the ghost, uttering the ever memorable words, "It is finished." There would seem to be nothing very remarkable in the endurance of physical suffering incident to crucifixion. The two thieves were executed in the same manner, and yet retained their presence of mind and ability to reason, reflect, and converse; and one, at least, to repent and pray and believe.

That the sufferings of Christ were different and infinitely

greater there can be no doubt. The degree of his sufferings before he was crucified may be inferred from his agonizing plaints in the garden, "My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." Matt. xxvi, 38. The separation of that pure and immaculate soul from that perfect body was surely effected under the joint influence of mental and physical sufferings; the sorrows of the soul and torture of the body. That body was perfect, and remained perfect, in all its organs and parts. It was no further broken than was effected by the nails, the thorns, and the spear, which only separated the living tissues, but did not destroy them; no part could be subjected to disintegration or corruption. It was predicted that his body should be pierced, and this was done, and no more; the surrender of life was nevertheless a voluntary act.

To sustain the theory of Dr. Stroud, a literal signification is given to certain passages found in the prophets and Psalms, such as these: Psa. cix, 22, "For I am poor and needy, and my heart is wounded within me." That this passage has a moral and not a material signification must be clear to the mind of the most superficial reader. The term *breaking* of the heart, as used in the Scriptures, generally, if not always, signifies deep emotion. As in Psa. xxxiv, 18, "The Lord is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart." A repetition of the same is seen in Psa. li, 17, "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." Here the metaphors are so mixed that the meaning is apparent. Again, Isaiah lxi, 1, "He hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted," etc. All such expressions refer to the moral, and not the physical, condition of the heart, and are out of place in the attempts to support this theory.

Let us again return to the language of John xix, 34, "But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came thereout blood and water;" not the *constituents* of blood, but *blood* and *water*. There is no intimation here that the heart was pierced; it was simply the *side* that was pierced; which side we are not informed. It might have been the left side, it might have been the right. These symbols of sacrifice and purifying agency were necessary at the time, and were doubtless supplied by divine interposition. The conception and birth of our Lord were miraculous; his life was full of



miracle; why then attempt, in this gross and bungling way, to explain this very important incident of his crucifixion on natural principles, and thus detract from the glory of Christ by making his death result from physical infirmity? When Moses struck the flinty rock the rugged mass was dry and destitute of water, and had remained so for countless ages; yet, under the stroke, God caused the water to gush out, and flow in such abundance as to supply the wants of the mighty hosts of Israel for succeeding years. That rock represented Christ, who on the cross from his cleft side yielded *blood and water*; and on the same principle, and for the same reason, namely, because it was necessary.

That the theory of Dr. Stroud, accepted by so many, is not only false and irreverent, but disproved by physiological science, is susceptible of easy demonstration.

First, as to the reverence due that sacred person. We assert that the human body of Christ was perfect in all its parts, and retained its organic integrity throughout the whole of his earthly existence, and especially at the time of his death on the cross. Under the Jewish law a diseased animal could not be offered in sacrifice; and much less could the great antitype expiate the sins of the whole world in offering a diseased or imperfect body, which he must have done if this theory be correct.

Secondly, the issuing of blood from the side does not prove that the heart was touched, and cannot reverently be assumed while inspired testimony is silent on the subject.

Thirdly, admitting the hypothesis, for the sake of the argument, that the heart had yielded, and being literally broken had filled the pericardium, and that the sac had been pierced, the fluid following the withdrawal of the spear must have been supplied from some other source than the heart. This we shall now proceed to demonstrate.

1. The perfect heart is the strongest and most compact muscular organ in the human body; and it is so closely invested by that strong vital sac called the pericardium, that some portion of the sac is in constant contact with its surface. Indeed, it is a double sac or pouch; one layer investing and applying closely to the surface of the heart, the other lying free around it, but so completely adapted to the heart in

shape and size that the heart completely fills it when in action. So close is this investment that the least deposit of organic lymph, in disease, upon the surface of the investing fold, produces a grating sound by the friction of the altered surfaces, though the deposit may be thin as the finest tissue paper; quite easily detected by the ear, placed on the chest over the cardiac region. In the healthy state of the organ there is not room for more than two or three drachms of fluid after including the heart.

2. The cases mention by Dr. Stroud, and adopted by his reviewers in this country, in which a large quantity of fluid had accumulated within the pericardium, were evidently such as had suffered from long-continued previous diseases, the abnormal, or enlarged condition of the sac, furnishing conclusive proof of a morbid change under diseased action.

3. In ordinary cases of death the autopsy, or ocular examination, is deferred for eight or ten hours after death, between which time and the autopsy important changes have usually taken place in the fluids and solids. Here all analogy between the case of the ordinary corpse and the body of Christ fails. He had just expired, and the piercing was done from mere wantonness, and its having been predicted does not alter the case.

4. Many sudden deaths have occurred under the influence and from the effects of sudden grief, fear, joy, or violent physical exertions, after which, on the closest inspection, no lesion of any organ or tissue could be detected; the cause of death seeming to have been the mere arrest, or suspension, of the nervous currents, or want of brain power.

5. The language so often occurring in the Holy Scriptures, and in other highly poetic writings, alluding to the breaking of the heart under strong emotional excitement, is employed figuratively, and will be so universally understood notwithstanding the occasional actual occurrence of the accident.

6. It will be proper in this place to give a general description of the heart, in order that our argument may be more clear.

The heart is a double organ; the right auricle, or pouch, receiving the venous blood from every part of the body, except the lungs, whence it passes into the right ventricle; thence

through the pulmonary arteries to the lungs, where it parts with its carbon and receives oxygen; thence returning through the pulmonary veins to the left side of the heart, the blood is poured into the left auricle and thence into the left ventricle, and from there, by the impulse of the heart and other vital forces, it is sent through those elastic tubes called arteries to every part of the body; the onward motion being regulated by a system of valves, necessary here to notice, but not further to describe. The substance of the heart is made up of small, tough, muscular fibers, arranged with a view to secure great strength and capability of continuous action. When the embryo assumes organic form the heart begins to act, and never ceases acting until life is extinct, and in some animals not even then for a time, as it continues pulsating several hours after it is removed from the body.

7. The medium weight of the human heart is nine ounces, and the walls of the cavities at their thinnest parts are about a line and a half in thickness, being in structure firm, composed of many layers of those strong muscular fibers, crossed and interlaced, all of which acquire further resisting power from the peculiar vitality with which the substance of the organ is endowed.

8. The valves of the heart oppose but slight resistance to the regurgitation, or backward motion, of the blood, even after the barrier has been passed. From this we must perceive, that in a perfectly healthy condition of the heart any violent action must throw the blood backward and forward with corresponding force through the natural channels, in which case the heart could not be put upon the stretch so as to create danger of its rupture. In a sound state no such thing as a lacerated heart can happen.

9. But suppose the heart could literally break; a broken organ occupies more space than a whole one, and, consequently, the pericardium would be filled to its utmost capacity of distention with the lacerated organ, leaving no room for the deposit of fluid.

10. Finally, suppose the fluid blood could distend and occupy considerable space within the pericardium, and thus suddenly separate into two parts, clot and serum; the serum might indeed flow out, but not the other part, which is made

to represent the blood, as tough coagula could not *flow* or pass through the orifice made by the passage of a spear. And even if all this were possible it could not truly be called blood; it would only be one of the constituents of blood, which must utterly fail of the design either as a fact or figure. Thus we see the hypothesis is completely refuted and demolished.

These, with many other reasons and facts which might be brought forward, patent and conclusive, compel us to reject and utterly repudiate this theory of the "physical cause of the death of Christ," not only as false and absurd, but repugnant to the sentiment of pious reverence due the person of Christ, and calculated to sap the foundations of our faith by impairing the validity of the vicarious sufferings of our Lord. This theory represents Christ as dying of *necessity* from a weakness or defect in his human body.

This holy sacrifice was without blemish. "Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a *body* hast thou prepared me." The animal sacrifices, though perfect in their kind, were only shadows of this. His body was *prepared*, and was perfect in all the attributes of complete manhood, mighty in its human energies and powers of endurance. Though sometimes weary, it was after great toil; though sometimes hungry, it was after long fasting. The prophet had said, "He shall not fail nor be discouraged." He was strong at the center of his human nature. When his mission required, he could set aside the wants of his nature and continue his fasts, his journeys, and his labors indefinitely. When the rugged and hardy disciples sank under their fatigues and vigils he was still alert and watchful, and it was that even balanced and powerful organization that made him so.

His death could not have been accidental, and at the same time by special appointment. He accomplished death; death had no necessary power over him, neither was it necessary to call in some of the accidental agencies of dissolution to assist in accomplishing death. He is the conqueror of death, but humbled himself to the *condition* of the dead for an end; and then by his own act resumed his life, tarried on earth a few days, to make the proof of his resurrection sure, then assumed immortality for his humanity, and carried it with him to

heaven. Not a fiber lost, nor a mark effaced that is necessary to make his person perfect, or the atonement complete.

This theme is often made prominent, especially by our younger ministry, in declamations from the pulpit. It is startling and novel to many, and calculated to arouse the attention. It brings the most striking act in the great atonement and sacrifice before the mind in a concrete form, which will cling to the memory when the remainder of the discourse and the preacher are forgotten. And just here is the evil. It fixes a fact in the mind which will detract from the dignity of Christ's character and open the door for infidel speculations.

---

#### ART. V.—THE AFRICO-AMERICAN.

THE American negro, so long an unrecognized element in society, has at length become the disturbing ingredient in modern civilization, and the unresolved factor in the political and social problems of the age. During the earlier periods of our nation's career his existence was, for the most part, persistently ignored, and now it is only reluctantly that men accord to him the consideration that they are unable any longer to withhold. The time has, indeed, at length fully come when his demanded recognition can no longer be denied, nor the questions thus brought into notice be kept further in abeyance. We, therefore, rather accept than choose the theme of present disquisition as foremost among the vital questions of the times. The subject is, however, beset with unusual and formidable difficulties, both from its inextricable partisan entanglements, and from the prevailing deficiency of reliable statistics and other data; for of almost no other of the great questions of the age are even generally well-informed persons so deplorably ignorant.

Viewed in all its extent, this subject very fully and forcibly illustrates the invincible vitality of great principles, and their power to survive temporary defeats and to work out at length their appropriate results. Human history presents scarcely another such instance of essential wrong so hedged about by

its circumstances, which at once concealed its iniquities and defied its assailants, as African slavery. It has been, in short, an experiment of the possibility of maintaining a system at war with Christianity and repugnant to all the better instincts of human nature, in the light of modern civilization; and that experiment, fairly made, has also wholly failed, and the system has fallen by its own inherent destructiveness. The world of mankind has marked its progress for nearly three centuries, and as the result, the voice of enlightened humanity became both loud and unanimous in its condemnation as a ruinous and complicated villainy. Thus it is that ideas are seen to be the great and indestructible power whose triumph, though often delayed, is sure to come at length. The sword may be the immediate agent to effect revolutions; but only when evoked by the action of great principles and potential ideas, and while acting in obedience to them, can it accomplish permanent results. The civilization of the age is not only illuminated with intelligence, it is also instinct with conscientiousness; and therefore every interest becomes strong or weak according as it is or is not in harmony with justice and righteousness. It is, doubtless, often difficult for the most trustful to wait for the slow though certain developments of results; but the confident expectation of the final vindication of the right is not more the child of faith than the sure lesson of human history. The results of this long and painful process of experiment are now maturing before us, and the present age, especially in this country, is gathering the harvest that other times have sowed and cultivated with so much suffering and labor.

African slavery, as an American institution, is coeval with the colonization of the new world. The English nation holds the bad pre-eminence in its maintenance, because of its superior success in founding and conducting colonies; though it has been outdone by Spain in the rapid consumption of Africans as an article of merchandise or a productive agent. The field for slavery, where it has flourished most largely and been maintained in the greatest simplicity, has been the region within the tropics; though it has also become thoroughly and firmly rooted in the temperate portions of both hemispheres. In the West Indian Islands which are still dependences of



various European kingdoms, the administration of the system has varied according to the policy of the home government. In the Spanish Islands it is still maintained in all its rigors, requiring large annual supplies of newly-imported Africans to meet its demands for consumption. In all the other islands except San Domingo, where the negroes have achieved both freedom and political independence, slavery has been abolished by the home governments. On the American continent the republic of Mexico, and those of Central and South America, have all abolished the system by organic laws; while in Brazil it has been so modified and meliorated that its steady decline and not remote extinction seem to be pretty well assured. The effectual suppression of the African slave-trade, which, now that the American flag no longer protects it, may be reckoned an accomplished fact, must either modify or wholly destroy the system in Cuba; and last and best of all, the final downfall of the abomination of desolation in this country is at length, though very recently and most strangely, passed into history.

The history of the African slave-trade, could it be written, would no doubt constitute the darkest chapter in the records of human cruelty and remorseless lust for gain. How many of Africa's hapless sons and daughters, many of them persons of somewhat elevated social and political standing, and some of respectable culture and scholarship, have been torn from their homes, and how many of these have left their bones to mark the highway of slave-ships over the ocean, and what has been the personal history of the hundreds of thousands that have been brought to America, can never be known. The very imperfect and fragmentary accounts that we have, sufficiently prove that a fearful order of things prevailed in that business, and suggest also the thought that for these things there may still be a terrible account to be rendered. A very hasty examination of some of these facts will now be undertaken, taking the island of Jamaica as an example of the whole, though probably its record is better than that of either the Spanish or French islands.

Of the progress of the slave population, and of the importation of Africans into the British West Indies, some estimate may be made from the imperfect statistics now accessible.

JAMAICA was seized by the British in 1655, when the few slaves then in the island fled to the mountains, and thence kept up a war of depredation against the whites, being reinforced from time to time by recruits from among the slaves of their enemies. An accommodation was at length arranged, but of course, after the negroes had placed themselves in the power of the whites, the terms of capitulation were very little regarded. The wars of the Maroons, which originated in that affair, present a varied picture of cruelty and perfidy on one side, and of valor and romance on the other. In 1658, three years after the occupation of the island by the English, the number of slaves was only 1,400, twelve years later there were 8,000, and in 1673 there were 9,504. From that date to 1734, a period of sixty-one years, we have no data as to the number of negroes in the island; but at the end of that term there were found to be 86,546, showing an average annual increase of more than 1,200. In 1775 the aggregate number of Africans and their descendants in the island was 194,614. On the other side, it is ascertained from reliable data that up to that time there had been brought to that island from Africa not far from 500,000 captives, of which number a little more than one fourth (137,114) had been re-exported, leaving about 360,000 imported where less than 200,000 remained. A report, made to the provincial assembly of Jamaica in 1791, gives the number of slaves as 250,000, showing an increase of more than 50,000 in sixteen years. The commercial statistics of the same period show the importation of Africans to have amounted to more than 100,000. Allowing 10,000 for the free negroes in the island in 1791—a large estimate—we have a living negro population of 260,000 remaining from an importation of more than 600,000. We are thus brought to the terrible demonstration that during the eighteenth century the system of slavery as actually maintained in Jamaica, under British rule, not only effectually hindered any natural increase of the enslaved race, but also literally used up more than half of those imported. During the seventeen years from 1791 to 1808, at which latter date the foreign slave-trade became unlawful, about 160,000 Africans were imported; and nine years later, in 1817, the number in the island was no less than 346,150, giving an increase in twenty-four years

of about 85,000, which would indicate an importation during these years of not far from 200,000, for natural increase seems to have been a thing unknown during these years.

From the last date, 1817, by which time the foreign trade had been pretty effectually suppressed, till the date of emancipation in 1833, the negro population steadily declined. In 1820 the aggregate had fallen off about three thousand, or a little less than 1,000 per annum. By 1826 a further loss of over 11,000 had taken place—nearly 2,000 per annum. In 1833, when the final registration of slaves was made preparatory to emancipation, there were reckoned only 311,119, showing a loss of nearly 20,000 during the preceding seven years, and of more than 34,000, or ten per cent., in sixteen years. Of this decadence of the slave population a very small proportion was due to emancipations made during this period; of which it is ascertained, however, that but very few were made. Another class of statistics shows conclusively the manner by which this strange loss occurred. During the twelve years from 1817 to 1829 the whole number of births reported among the slave population was 69,102, of deaths 75,412, excess of deaths 6,312, of which excess more than half occurred during the last quarter of the term. These statistics are, indeed, incomplete, as they do not cover the whole period; but they are quite unimpeachable as to the relative proportions of the births and deaths. Were they complete the aggregate loss would appear greater than is here represented. From the best estimates that can be made from the imperfect data now accessible, it seems probable that the number of Africans brought to Jamaica and not re-exported, before the year 1817, exceeded by more than two to one the number found in that island at that time. It is also plain that the destructive agencies by which the raw Africans had been consumed during the continuance of the slave-trade did not cease their wasting with the suppression of the traffic, but for obvious natural causes it relatively increased. As a summary of the above we give an extract from an able and judicious treatise on the subject:

Viewing these facts, not a doubt can, we think, be entertained that the number of negroes imported into the island and

retained for its consumption was more than double the number that existed there in 1817, and could scarcely have been less than 750,000. . . . If to these we were to add the children that must have been born on the island in the long period of 178 years, and then reflect that all who remained for emancipation amounted to only 311,000, we should find ourselves forced to the conclusion that slavery was here attended with a destruction of life almost without a parallel in the history of any civilized nation.—*Carey's Slave-Trade*, p. 12.

A like examination into the affairs of the other British West India islands would show that the horrors of Jamaican slavery were not confined to that island, but extended over the others with little if any mitigation. In BARBADOES the number of slaves in 1753 was 69,870; in 1817, sixty-four years after, during which time slaves were constantly imported, there were only 77,493. In this island the slave system was somewhat meliorated before the time of general emancipation, and accordingly, after the cessation of the foreign trade, the increase was greater from natural causes alone than before the cessation of foreign importation. The case of slavery in Barbadoes is clearly an exceptional one, by reason of the good treatment extended to the bondmen during the last years of the continuance of slavery, and the better condition of the freedmen at and immediately after their emancipation. In Trinidad, out of a total slave population of 23,537, the deaths in twelve years amounted to 8,774, equal to  $37\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., or more than three per cent. per annum. The births during the same period were 6,001, only a little more than two to three deaths. In GRENADA there were in 1769 an aggregate of 35,000 negroes; and notwithstanding a steady and large importation was kept up, nine years later (1778) there were only 25,021. The whole number emancipated was only 23,471. For the solution of a case so startling it is only necessary to consult the statistics of births and deaths for the fourteen years from 1817 to 1831, during which time the births were 1,101, the deaths 1,972. The whole number of slaves emancipated in all the British dependences in 1834, when of course every one was enumerated, because each one was to be paid for by the government, was 780,993, a sum less by 38,811 than the number found in the same provinces five years before, when there was no such motive for a full return. This shows an annual net

loss of nearly *one per cent.* For the West Indies proper we find the following summary:

The number emancipated in the West Indies was 660,000; and viewing the facts that have been placed before the reader, we can scarcely err much in assuming that the number imported and retained for consumption in those colonies had amounted to 1,700,000. This would give about two and a half imported for one that was emancipated; and there is reason to think that it might be placed as high as three for one, which would give a total import of almost two millions.—*Carey's Slave-Trade*, p. 14.

Terrible as was the waste of life in the British West Indies during the whole period of the existence of slavery in those islands, there is good reason for believing that the slaves were quite as humanely treated there as in any other part of the world where the plantation system of slavery, as contradistinguished from the domestic, was maintained. The controlling purpose in all ordinary cases of slave-holding, whether by individuals or nations, is the pecuniary profit of the enslavers. If that purpose is most certainly attainable by the rapid consumption of the slaves, and the importation of fresh supplies, that course will be taken, often unconsciously by the agent himself, and it will be but slightly modified by the humanity or the cruelty of the immediate agents of the work. The lust for gain, in which slavery is rooted, is not only imperious in its demands, but also impatient of delay. It requires the largest early returns, and will not consent to defer present gain to remote, and therefore somewhat uncertain, advantages, though these promise to be much greater.

To properly estimate the workings of West Indian slavery it will be necessary to look into something more than the mere question of numbers, as given above. The moral and social condition of the slaves, and of the negroes generally, must be taken into the account. Now it is known that these negroes were kept in a condition of ignorance and barbarism compared with which their state in Africa was one of tolerable civilization. From the hour they left their native shores to that of their deaths, the sole practical purpose of their existence was to bring gain to those who possessed them; and since the only use to which they were to be put was unskilled

manual labor, their mental culture was either unthought of, or discouraged as impertinent or dangerous. Each man landed from a slave-ship represented a certain amount of capital, to be employed for the benefit of the proprietor, and the opinion of capitalists favored rapidity of production and of course of consumption. The facts that have come to us abundantly prove that the attempts made by missionaries, and other philanthropic persons, for the moral and mental improvement of the negroes, were regarded with but little favor by the planters, and though great praise may be due to the self-sacrificing men who engaged in that work, it is also quite evident that their success was but limited and partial. During the whole period of slavery in Jamaica, the great body of the slaves were in a condition of gross and degraded barbarism. While the slave-trade was in full operation there were five men to one woman among them, which at once indicates the utter absence of society, and also accounts, in part at least, for the very small natural increase of population. As a means of civilization, West Indian slavery was a great practical failure, or rather it was never designed to effect anything of the sort, for the negro race as found in those islands at the time of the cessation of the slave-trade was probably really lower in mental and moral standing than an equal number of their kindred in the interior of Africa. The experiment carried on at such a terrible expense for two hundred years, ought certainly to have satisfied all who were willing to learn that the continuance of slavery is incompatible with a process of preparation for freedom, and, therefore, that immediate and not gradual emancipation is the only way of escape from the system.

But since slavery was maintained at such expense for the pecuniary benefit of the slave-owner, it may not be impertinent to inquire into the economical relations of the system. No doubt a good many persons became rich by pursuing the calling of planters in the West Indies. Adventurers in many cases amassed large fortunes, and dazzled their bewildered admirers with the display of their hastily gotten riches. But such facts settle nothing as to the general economical results of the system. These must be inquired for among the records of commerce and agriculture for those islands, as shown by full



and extensive statistics extending over long periods of years, and by the condition of the colonies as improved or otherwise at somewhat remote after-times, and these, it must be confessed, are anything but favorable.

From a statistical report of the exports of the island of Jamaica from 1772 to 1857, we select four principal articles, sugar, coffee, ginger, and pimento, to show the progress of this island's productions. Until 1791 we have accounts of only sugar and coffee, and during these twenty years the export of sugar increased from a little more than 76,000 hogsheads to 91,000, and of coffee, from 841,558 pounds to 2,299,874. Two years later the quantity of sugar exported had declined about ten per cent., and that of coffee increased more than forty per cent. The sugar crop generally increased, though not uniformly from year to year, till 1805, when the exportation reached 150,352 hogsheads. The next year the exportation of coffee reached 29,298,000 pounds, and of pimento 2,541,000. The largest ginger crop (3,621,260 pounds) was made in 1797; and in 1809 the export of pimento reached nearly four and a half millions of pounds, an amount never reached again for twenty years. Then again it increased rapidly, and in 1833 nearly eight and a half million pounds were exported. It thus appears that the productiveness of the system of slave labor had been fairly tried under most favorable conditions, and had culminated and begun to decline during the first decade of the present century. From 1805 (when the sugar crop reached over 150,000 hogsheads) the production of sugar steadily declined, till in 1833, the last year of slavery, it had fallen to 83,000. The largest coffee crop (34,000,000 pounds) was made in 1813; in 1833 it was less than 10,000,000 pounds. From its highest point (over three and a half millions) in 1797, the ginger crop fell down to less than half a million in 1822, but had rallied again to nearly three millions in 1833. The pimento crop has been very variable, but generally advancing. In 1794 it reached two and three quarter millions of pounds, and only three years later it was less than half a million. In 1809 it had risen to nearly four and a half millions, then it declined for some years, but rallied again, and in 1833 reached an aggregate of 8,423,100 pounds. From this point it again declined to less than one and a half millions, but has since more than recovered the

highest point given above. It appears that the productive capacity of slave labor in Jamaica had reached its highest point about the year 1805, while the foreign slave-trade was still in full operation, and the whole course of legislation, whether imperial or colonial, was directed to favor that system of industry. And though the foreign slave-trade was made illegal a few years later, it is evident that it was actively prosecuted for ten years after it had been made unlawful. But the system of slave labor, as a form of productive industry, had run itself out, and with all its natural and legal advantages undiminished it was becoming every year less and less profitable. The ruin of the industry of the island, though often attributed to emancipation, was already far gone when the act of emancipation took place; and that only put an end to a system that had proved a failure, whether viewed in its economical or its moral and socialistic relations.

There is no good reason to question the genuineness of the philanthropy of those who championed the cause of West Indian emancipation in the British Parliament, and in the nation at large. We gladly accord to them all honor, notwithstanding the dishonorable position occupied by many of their sons as to the same cause in this country. It is, however, quite certain that the claims of justice in that case owed its success quite as much to the economical failure of slavery as to British love of freedom. It was because the West Indies were bankrupt, and yearly becoming more and more hopelessly insolvent, that British statesmen consented to seem to be just. Throughout the whole range of those beautiful islands, where the slave system had enjoyed every advantage of which its essential perversity left it capable, the universal order of things, down to the time of emancipation, was made up of foreign indebtedness, mortgaged estates, and future crops drawn upon, and the proceeds expended; in brief, an all-pervading bankruptcy. The system had broken down under its own inherent depravity before the nation had practically discovered that it was morally wrong.

The origin of African slavery in the territory now constituting the United States of America dates from the early days of its colonization. But though the existence of slavery is incidentally recognized from time to time through all parts of

the national annals, it is usually referred to vaguely, and very little care seems to have been used to record its facts or to collate its statistics. Accordingly the whole subject, though so near to us as to both time and place, is but little understood. The following extract presents a condensed estimate of certain important facts of the case :

In the North American provinces, now the United States, negro slavery existed from a very early period, but on a limited scale, as the demand for slaves [white apprentices] was mainly supplied from England. The exports from the colonies were bulky, and the white could be imported as return cargo; whereas the blacks would have required a voyage to Africa, with which little trade was maintained. The export from England ceased after the Revolution of 1688, and thenceforward negro slaves were somewhat more freely imported. The only information on the subject, furnished by M<sup>r</sup>Pherson in his "Annals of Commerce," is that in eight months, ending July 12, 1753, the number of negroes imported into Charleston, S. C., was 511; and that in the year 1765-6 the value of negroes imported from Africa into Georgia was 14,820 pounds; and this, if valued at only ten pounds each, would give only 1,482 negroes. From 1783 to 1787, the number exported from all the West India Islands to this country was 1,392, being an average of less than 300 per annum; and there is little reason for believing that this number was increased by any importation direct from Africa. The British West Indies were the entrepot of the trade, and thence they were supplied to the other islands, and the settlement on the Main; and had the demand for this country been considerable, it cannot be doubted that a large portion of the thousands then annually exported would have been sent in this direction.—*Carey's "Slave-Trade,"* pp. 16, 17.

These meager statistics seem to comprise the sum of our detailed information upon the subject. They are manifestly too incomplete to serve as a basis for any general conclusions, and accordingly the writer just quoted resorts to estimates based upon ascertained *data* in the colonial period, as compared with the well-ascertained facts of later times. From the various United States censuses we have reliable information as to the number of colored persons, slaves and free, from 1790 to 1860, and, as well, their ratio of increase. Assuming their natural increase to have been in the same ratio before as since the first national census, (1790,) it is easy to determine pretty accurately what portion of the actual increase was by births, and what by importation. In 1714 the whole number of per-

sons of the African race in the provinces which afterward became the United States was 58,850, of whom probably about one half were imported Africans. Allowing a decennial increase of twenty-five per cent., the number in 1750 would have been not far from 130,000. But the actual number at that date was no less than 220,000, leaving 90,000 to be credited to the foreign slave-trade. Starting with this ascertained number in 1750, and coming down to 1790, (the date of the first United States census,) when the actual number of negroes in the country was again determined, and assuming the decennial increase by excess of births over deaths to have been at the rate of twenty-five per cent., we may readily determine also the numbers imported into the country. To show the whole at a glance we will put it in tabular form.

Years.	Actual Numbers.	Natural Increase.	Actual Increase.	Importation.
1750	220,000	.....	.....	.....
1760	310,000	55,000	90,000	35,000
1770	462,000	77,000	152,000	75,000
1780	582,000	115,500	120,000	5,000
1790	757,363	145,500	175,363	29,863

From all these facts and estimates it appears that the whole number of Africans brought into this country down to 1714 was not far from 30,000; from 1714 to 1750, about 90,000; from 1750 to 1790, 143,500; and from 1790 to 1808, (when the slave-trade was abolished,) about 70,000, making a grand total of 333,500, or a third of a million, which had grown by natural increase to nearly twice and a half that number, thus presenting a remarkable contrast to the destructive process noticed in the case of the British West Indies.

During the first decade of the present century the increase of the colored population of the country was no less than 378,374. Of this amount about 30,000 came in by the annexation of Louisiana, leaving nearly 350,000 (equal to an increase of thirty-five per cent.) to come from other sources. The natural increase, at the ratio assumed above, would have been nearly a hundred thousand less, calling for an importation of that number. But all the known facts of the case are against such a conclusion; for only the states of South Carolina and Georgia allowed the slave-trade at that time, and those only eight of the ten years; and it is known that only

twenty small vessels were employed in the trade. And as during the next ten years, when the foreign slave-trade had entirely ceased, the increase was at the rate of thirty per cent., there is good reason for supposing that that ratio was equaled during the former ten years, which would bring down the number to be credited to importation very nearly to that given in our first reckoning. We give, again using the tabular form, the number of colored persons in the country at each decennial census, with the aggregate increase by decades, and the ratio.

Years.	Aggregate.	Increase.	Ratio.
1790	757,363	.....	..
1800	1,001,436	244,073	·32
1810	1,379,374	377,938	·37
1820	1,771,629	392,255	·29
1830	2,328,642	536,913	·31
1840	2,873,758	545,116	·23½
1850	3,638,962	765,104	·26½
1860	4,435,709	796,747	·22

The first two terms of increase given in the above table were somewhat aided by the foreign slave-trade, the former, however, but slightly, as very few slaves were then imported. During the second ten years—the first of the century—that trade was somewhat quickened, as the improved condition of the country created a demand for labor. The increase, however, was manifestly almost wholly by the excess of births over deaths. After the cessation of the foreign slave-trade, and during a decade marked by war and great financial depression, the ratio of increase declined from thirty-seven per cent. to twenty-nine, but rallied again during the next term of ten years to thirty-one, which is probably about the normal rate of increase of such a population. Since then it has declined very considerably but not steadily, and during the ten years between 1850 and 1860 it reached a remarkable, not to say alarming, degree of depression.

The conclusions to which these things compel us is, first of all, that slavery as it has existed in the United States has been, for the most part, of the mildest possible type. This is proved beyond a doubt by the fact that the births so largely exceeded the deaths, a condition of things that can exist only where the physical requirements are well and sufficiently met.

American negroes are proverbially prolific and long lived, the two sufficient conditions of rapid natural increase. The interests of the ruling class have affected this rate of increase, alternately to accelerate and to retard it. The steady demand for able-bodied slaves to open the new lands of the South and Southwest made slave breeding profitable, so as to sensibly affect the result as shown by the census. This influence operated most fully and with least interference from 1820 to 1830, when the ratio of natural increase reached its maximum, thirty-one per cent. After that date the demand for slave labor became so great that it was often found more profitable to use the slave women as producers of cotton, rice, and sugar, than of young negroes, and accordingly the rate of increase fell off during the next ten years more than a quarter. It slightly recovered from its depression during the next decade, but sunk still lower during the last. But it is sufficiently evident that our slave system was strong and vigorous at the opening of the present decade, and that left to itself it might have continued for half a century longer.

From 1790 to 1860, the free colored population of the country increased over eightfold; the slave population about five and a half fold. But in their growth the two classes did not advance together, but rather alternately; nor was the rate of increase of the two classes, reckoned as one, uniform. In the early years of the republic public sentiment was strongly opposed to slavery, and emancipations were numerous; but the foreign slave-trade more than made good the deductions thus made from the proportion of slaves to free negroes. When the slave-trade had ceased, the practice of emancipating had also pretty effectually run its course, so that during the ten years from 1810 to 1820 the two classes were left to their proper natural increase; the free increasing at the rate of twenty-five per cent., and the slaves thirty. Between the years 1820 and 1830 slavery was abolished in the states of New York and New Jersey, by which some fifteen thousand slaves were set free; and yet during that decade the rate of increase of slaves in the country considerably exceeded the average ratio. Since 1830 the rate of increase of free blacks has steadily and rapidly declined till it has become less than half the natural rate. The progress of the slave population has



been more uniform, though there has been a decline there also. From 1820 to 1830 the increase was nearly twenty-nine per cent.; the next ten years it was more than thirty and a half; then it declined to less than twenty-four for the next decade; from 1840 to 1850 it rallied again to nearly twenty-nine, but fell off during the next decade to only a little more than twenty-three per cent.

These data, collected from the census returns, show very clearly the increase by excess of births over deaths of the whole colored population of the United States. A very few have probably been introduced from abroad, both free and slaves; and about as many perhaps have left the country either as emigrants or fugitives. These two elements may therefore be disregarded in our estimates. It appears, then, that in the best physical conditions compatible with the state of slavery, the natural increase of such a class of persons may be carried above thirty per cent. for a term of ten years; any falling short of that rate must therefore be charged to defective physical provisions, or to disturbance of domestic and social relations. Among the free people of color these causes of limited increase operated much more largely than among slaves, owing to their poverty and unwillingness to be burdened with large families, and also to their isolated condition, scattered sparsely among the whites; and these rather than any special mortality among them, whether in infancy or in later life, must be charged with effecting this diminution of their increase. Two closely-related causes must be recognized as operating against the largest natural increase of the slave population: the internal slave-trade, by which the *quasi* marriage relations of slaves were interrupted, and overworking, where the immediate fruits of slave labor was esteemed more valuable than slaves themselves. It is well ascertained that when slaves command a high price, and slave labor is dear, that their natural increase is diminished, because slave women are worth more to use up in the field or factory than for raising young slaves. These two causes operated together, and their results are seen in the falling off from the maximum increase, above noted.

The following table (copied from the "Preliminary Report of the Eighth [U. S.] Census," for 1860) shows the growth of

the colored population of the whole country since the taking of the first general census in 1790:

Years.	Free Colored.	Increase pr. ct.	Slaves.	Increase pr. ct.	Total Colored.	Inc. pr. ct.
1790	59,466	....	697,897	....	757,363	....
1800	108,395	82.28	893,041	27.97	1,001,436	32.23
1810	186,466	72.00	1,191,364	33.40	1,337,810	37.58
1820	233,554	25.23	1,538,038	28.79	1,771,562	28.58
1830	319,599	36.87	2,009,043	30.61	2,328,642	31.44
1840	386,303	20.87	2,487,455	23.81	2,873,758	23.41
1850	439,449	12.40	3,204,313	28.82	3,638,762	26.62
1860	482,122	10.97	3,953,587	23.38	4,435,709	21.90

For the first and second terms of the above table, the rate of increase is above the highest natural standard, during the first only slightly, but much more largely during the second, owing to the continuance of the foreign slave-trade. After 1810 that source of supply ceased, and the rate of increase declined nearly one fourth. The next ten years carried it up again to over thirty-one per cent.; and as only natural causes of increase were then in operation, that rate may be taken as a maximum, even in the most favorable conditions. The causes of the subsequent falling off of increase have already been intimated.

In the next table we give the aggregate colored population (slave and free) in the Eastern and Middle states at each general census, putting the six eastern (New England) states together.

	1790.	1800.	1810.	1820.	1830.	1840.	1850.	1860.
New England.....	17,033	18,559	19,906	20,756	21,376	22,657	23,021	24,713
Gain per cent.....	....	9	7½	5	2½	6	1½	7 2-5
New York.....	25,978	30,717	40,350	39,361	44,945	50,031	49,069	49,005
Gain per cent.....	....	18½	31½	-2½	14	11½	-2	....
New Jersey.....	14,185	16,824	18,694	20,018	20,557	21,718	24,046	25,318
Gain per cent.....	....	18	11	7	2½	3½	9½	5
Pennsylvania.....	10,274	16,271	23,287	30,413	38,333	47,918	53,626	56,849
Gain per cent.....	....	58½	43	30	27½	25	12	6

A number of curious facts are presented in this table which we have not room to consider. The careful reader will not fail to detect them.

The colored population of the Northwestern states, as shown by the last national census, was 65,652, of which number considerably more than half were in Ohio. These statistics, however, shed no new light upon the problem under exami-

nation; for except in Ohio, and scarcely there, the colored people are hardly an appreciable element in the population.

The facts that we have thus collated show in part the condition of the colored race in the Middle and Eastern states, and they demonstrate the infelicity of that condition, and its tendency to the worst possible social and economical results, that is, the destructive elimination of a constituent portion of the social body. Seventy-seven years ago the ratio of blacks to whites in these states was nearly seven per cent.; seven years ago it was less than two per cent. So small a proportion of the people may perhaps be left uncared for by our public economy, and the community not seem to suffer by it. But the effect of such neglect upon the subjects of it could not fail to be most disastrous. A pariah population, mixed through the social mass, with absolutely no social position, could scarcely fail to deteriorate in character and decline in numbers. Shut out of all society, high or low; excluded from schools and churches; admitted to none of the mechanical trades, and forbidden to earn a livelihood except in the most servile occupations; it were not strange if they have not increased numerically, nor risen above their original lowliness. It is rather strange that they have fought their way upward against such terrible odds even so far as to their present unelevated status.

The census of 1860 shows a slave population in fifteen states and the District of Columbia of almost four millions, and a free colored population of about a quarter of a million. The white population of the same states amounted to about eight millions. For all practical purposes the two races may be set down as holding the ratio of two whites to one colored. Of the colored people fifteen sixteenths were slaves. But these proportions between whites and blacks, and between free blacks and slaves, were not the same in all parts. There was a relative decrease of the slave population in all the more northern slave states, especially during the last decade, owing manifestly to the domestic slave-trade, by which the middle aged and the young negroes were carried away southward. This migration also very greatly interfered with the aggregate natural increase. Their distribution by classes is shown in the annexed table.

States.	Free Col.	Slaves.	Total Colored.	Whites.	Colored. per cent.	Whites. per cent.
*Alabama .....	2,690	435,080	437,178	526,431	45·37	54·63
Arkansas .....	144	111,115	111,259	324,143	25·55	74·45
Delaware .....	19,829	1,798	21,627	90,589	18·46	81·54
Florida .....	932	61,745	62,677	77,747	44·55	54·45
Georgia .....	3,500	462,198	465,698	591,550	49·81	50·19
Kentucky .....	10,640	225,483	236,123	859,725	21·55	78·45
Louisiana .....	18,647	331,726	350,473	357,629	49·48	50·52
Maryland .....	83,942	87,139	171,081	515,918	24·75	75·25
Mississippi .....	773	436,631	437,404	345,345	55·88	44·12
Missouri .....	3,572	114,931	118,504	1,063,489	10·03	89·97
North Carolina ..	30,463	331,059	361,522	629,942	36·46	63·54
South Carolina ..	9,914	402,406	412,320	291,388	58·53	41·47
Tennessee .....	7,300	275,719	283,019	826,722	28·03	71·97
Texas .....	355	182,566	182,921	420,891	30·11	69·89
Virginia .....	58,042	490,865	548,907	1,047,299	34·39	65·61
Dist. of Columbia.	11,131	3,185	14,316	60,764	19·04	80·96

In the older of these states, and especially those farthest north, it will be seen that the free blacks bear a comparatively large proportion to the whole colored population. The little state of Delaware was scarcely a slave state at all in 1860, except in the vigor of her slave code and the partisan proslaveryism of a portion of her people. In Maryland nearly half the colored population were free. Virginia, North Carolina, and Louisiana had each a considerable free colored population; while in the more southern and newer states that class formed scarcely an appreciable element.

As compared with the white population, it will be seen that the ratio differs widely in different states. In two states, South Carolina and Mississippi, the blacks were in majority. In Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Louisiana the two races were almost equally numerous. In all the region extending westward from the ocean side of South Carolina and Georgia to the Mississippi, the two races are substantially equal in number.

The number of mulattoes, or colored persons of mixed blood, is less considerable than has been supposed, though it may be doubted whether the census is entirely reliable in that particular. The ratio of "mulattoes" to "blacks" in some of the Northern states, and especially where the colored population is relatively very small, amounts to considerably more than fifty per cent. So also as to the free colored population of the

(formerly) slave states. In Louisiana, the rate per cent. of mulattoes among the free colored was over eighty-one; in Mississippi, over ninety-one; in Georgia, fifty-seven; in the Carolinas, seventy-one; in Virginia and the District of Columbia, forty; in Maryland, nineteen; in New Jersey, fifty. (!) Reckoned accurately, the rate per cent. of "mulattoes" and "blacks" among the whole free colored population of the country was in 1860, for the former 36.22, for the latter 63.78; for the slave population 10.41 and 89.59; and for the whole population of the country about thirteen per cent., or a little more than one eighth. It thus appears that seven eighths of our whole colored population were of pure African blood.

The mulattoes are most numerous in the older slave states, and in parts where there are most free negroes, for it was that class especially that received emancipation. The proportion of mulattoes has also steadily increased, as is shown by each successive census, since not only the children of parents of the opposite races are of that class, but also all those of parents of mixed blood. There is no good grounds for the popular fallacy that persons of that class are not both physically and mentally quite the equals of others of their own social position. Whether or not the mixing of the two races is physiologically and psychologically good or evil, we will not attempt to determine. It is certain that the advocates of the popular notion will find some difficult and stubborn facts to contend against in establishing their theory.

In all our late slave-holding states the negro had come to occupy a fairly designated place in the social body. His condition was recognized in the statute book, and in all the framework of society. He had his place in every family, and in all the departments of industry. The agriculture, the manufactures, and the commerce of the country all recognized him. Even the religious organizations did not ignore him; but while to the secular estimation he seemed only a beast of burden possessing a faint trace of reason, the better class of religionists recognized him as "a beast with a soul;" and accordingly some little regard was paid to his religious wants; only in matters of education he was entirely ignored. Four generations of people had succeeded each other, mutually bequeathing and inheriting the social state imposed by slavery.

The habits, the thoughts, the manner of living and acting induced by the relations of slave-holders, had become characteristic of the dominant race; and the corresponding reciprocal qualities had equally possessed the blacks. To this rule there were no doubt exceptional cases among both races; but they *were exceptions*, and so, according to the adage, proved the rule. The whole social structure of a contiguously-located community of twelve millions of people was interpenetrated with slavery. The value of every class of property depended upon slavery. The public peace, the safety of either race, the provisions for the necessities and the luxuries of life all depended on that feature of the social fabric.

The alternatives presented by the negro problem in 1860 were two only, to wit, its perpetuation by letting it alone, till it should die out by its inherent tendency to social ruin, exhausting the economical resources of the land and corrupting the public morality, or else its violent overthrow. The notion of removing slavery, or even mitigating it, by the deportation of the negroes, was the maddest, the most baseless, that ever found countenance in sane minds. There was nowhere to send them, nor any means of conveyance. The whites did not desire them away, and the blacks were violently opposed to going. The country needed their labor, and they needed to be fed and clothed. As for the once much-talked-of process of gradual emancipation it was simply impossible, and wholly undesirable had it been practicable; and when one considers all that was involved in the sudden and violent overthrow of that great social system, the disruption of society on so vast a scale, the disorganization of the labor of twelve million people, the destruction of commercial values, and the thorough derangement of the social fabric, for all these were necessarily involved in the abolition of slavery, it is not strange that most of those who most fully appreciated the subject drew back from the tremendous experiment. We fully sympathized with such, even while we differed from them as to the requirements of the case. But it was a matter of life and death with the nation even before the rebellion brought on the crisis. Like a cancer on the body, slavery was corrupting the life-blood of the nation, and hastening its catastrophe; so that the terrible experiment of the knife—of its violent removal—



was the only way of hope. The excision has been made, and the patient is upon the hands of the surgeons—the government. The wound is deep, somewhat inflamed, and not wholly without gangrene; but the patient is robust, though fearfully exhausted, and there is ground to hope that with good attention, and a thorough sanitary regimen, *in due course of time* a complete cure may be effected.

Our notices of West Indian slavery came down to 1833, the period of emancipation; of American slavery, to 1860, the very eve of the outbreak of the rebellion, which resulted in the overthrow of the system in this country. The facts we have presented show marked contrasts, and quite as remarkable coincidences in the two cases. The system of slavery in the West Indies was vastly more atrocious than anything known in this country, except in rare and isolated cases; for while, under the former, the births never nearly equaled the deaths, under the latter the natural productiveness reached a point seldom or never equaled in any other case. The reasons for this difference, though diverse, are sufficiently obvious. In the West Indies the slaves were seldom under the direct supervision of their owners, but were committed to the care of overseers, who sacrificed the laborers for the sake of immediate large returns. While the slave-trade continued it was thought more economical to import labor from Africa than to produce it in the colonies; and the same methods of labor and general treatment were continued during the short time between the abolition of the slave-trade and the act of emancipation. In this country the slaves and their masters were nearly always in close proximity, for slavery was here rather a domestic institution than merely an industrial one, and so both on account of the larger humanity of the masters, and from their greater carefulness of the negroes as property, the non-productiveness and the waste of life that prevailed in the West Indies were avoided. The non-residence of the West Indian proprietors was alone sufficient to insure the failure of their industrial system, and the waste of the property used, of whatever form. The presence and supervision of the proprietors in this country secured the physical well-being of the slaves, and at the same time rendered their labor more permanently profitable than in the other case.

The opening of new fields of industry in the South, especially the production of cotton, largely affected the condition of the slaves in all parts of the country. By reason of the increased demand for labor the price of slaves was greatly increased, first in the cotton-growing regions, and then elsewhere, causing a steady movement of able-bodied negroes toward the Southwest. Thus the older slave states became the American Guinea, from which the far South drew its supplies of slaves, and slave-breeding took the place of the foreign slave-trade. That this state of things was practically favorable to the increase of the negro race cannot be questioned. But as no registries of births and deaths of negroes were kept in any of the slave states, it is impossible to verify by statistics the inverse proportions of births and deaths in the more northern and more southern slave states. With the increase of the cotton culture, and the introduction of the plantation system, as contradistinguished from the domestic, in large regions of the South, the ratio of increase rapidly declined. The evils that had blighted the system as a form of industry in the West Indies were thus incorporated in the system of American slavery, resulting in its legitimate fruits, a diminished increase of population, and a decline in the value of slave labor. But the deterioration of American slavery was relatively retarded also by the presence of a more numerous free population, so constituting a more wholesome social body, in which the economics of the community were conserved. Society in our slave states in 1860 was in an incomparably better condition than was that of the West Indies thirty years before. A small but substantial middle class, made up of artisans, professional men, and small farmers, was found in nearly every part of the South, and especially in the grain-producing as distinguished from the cotton-growing regions, of which the West Indies was wholly destitute. These gave compactness and vitality to society, and by strengthening the social body at the same time gave stability to slavery. American slavery, therefore, came to its overthrow in a much less exhausted state than did its insular congener.

In each of these communities slavery was abolished by a power foreign to itself, and in both, in direct opposition to the wishes and protests of the ruling classes. In both countries

the freedmen, on awaking to their new life, found their former masters reduced to penury, and the communities of which they had so suddenly become members possessing very little available property. Upon the islands slavery, acting like the mistletoe on the tree upon which it for a time flourishes, but whose vitality it as certainly at length destroys, had thoroughly impoverished everything about it. In this country the work of impoverishment, though steadily advancing, had not gone nearly so far as with them; but the wastings of war completed what a vicious industrial system had not yet fully accomplished. Of the twenty million pounds sterling granted by the British Parliament to the planters as compensation for their slaves, very little went out of Great Britain; it scarcely sufficed to cancel the debts with which their estates were burdened. On the other hand, if the American planters received no compensation for their slaves, emancipated by a military decree, so they paid none, or nearly none, of the debts owed by them when the war-cloud overshadowed them. In both cases, therefore, emancipation came, bringing with it or finding society disrupted, industry disorganized, public confidence destroyed, the freedmen unable to set themselves to work, and their late masters scarcely better able; the freedmen bewildered or intoxicated by the strange revolution of their affairs, and the whites embittered, disheartened, and themselves scarcely less bewildered. In the case of the West Indies their comparative littleness, and the political insignificance of the whole community affected, made the whole affair relatively of very little account. Not so with us, however. Here twelve millions of people are involved in the catastrophe, comprising more than a third part of one of the great powers of the earth. A social revolution of such magnitude, so sudden and so thorough, has scarcely occurred in the history of our race.

To thoughtful minds a problem of such vast proportions, and beset with such formidable difficulties, cannot fail to suggest doubts and misgivings. Our nation is in the midst of an experiment of the most stupendous import, involving our exaltation or our overthrow. It is quite certain that the colored element cannot be eliminated from our population, and that their removal is neither practicable nor desirable. The nation must prosper or perish with them. But, happily, the case does

not come to us as an entirely untried experiment. Like transformations have been made elsewhere, though none on near so extensive a scale, and the results are generally of a most assuring character. Even in the British West Indies, where, as has been shown, slavery had done its worst before emancipation came, the colored population have evinced a wonderful recuperative power, and promise soon to restore those beautiful islands to something better than their former prosperity. The condition and surroundings of our freedmen are vastly better than were those in Jamaica, and the processes of industrial recovery and social reorganization will no doubt be correspondingly rapid.

We are not blind to the disorders and distractions that prevail in the "unreconstructed" states, and we are not surprised at them nor discouraged by them. But though passions seem for the time to bear rule, and partisanship to triumph over both patriotism and private interests, we still have hope. Passions are but for a season; reason and self-interest are perpetual, and must prevail at length. In the darkest hour of the power of the rebellion we still had confidence in the finality. So now in this no less trying crisis we still have faith in God and humanity. And may we not see the Divine Hand leading us now, as then? Our Moses, who under God had brought us through the wilderness of rebellion and intestine war, fell just as the nation was passing its Jordan; but our Joshua still lives, and through him, we trust, our God will soon give rest to his people.

---

#### ART. VI.—OUR PAST AND PRESENT RELATIONS TO SLAVERY.

JOHN WESLEY'S opinion that American slavery was "the vilest that the sun ever saw;" and Francis Asbury's prayer that "the infernal spirit of slavery" should be banished from Zion, indicate the principles and the policy of primitive Methodism. On this line the early Methodist ministry for many years literally pushed the battle to the gate. Preachers denounced it in such an unqualified manner that the people

renounced all connection with slavery, in order to obtain a standing in the Methodist Church. Annual conferences sent up memorials to the state legislatures asking for the abolition of slavery. General conferences stigmatized it as "an enormous evil," "an abomination," which they held in the deepest abhorrence, and were determined to extirpate. And the first bishops required the enforcement of the rules against slavery as a condition of continuing to supply those circuits and places where it was alleged that the rules were too obnoxious to be suffered.

This positive, uncompromising hostility to slavery made Methodism a power in the land, which was recognized in high places. It conferred with presidents and governors, and was listened to in legislative halls on behalf of the slave. And in the convention where the Constitution of the United States was formed, Methodism aided in holding back the oppressor's hand from blotting that document with the black words "slave" and "slavery." For it is matter of history that Mr. Marshall, afterward chief justice, urged with much emphasis, that if the government thus countenanced slavery it would lose the support of the Methodists and Quakers.

The momentum of Methodism in this direction was not kept up by the continued appliance of the forces which had produced it. It is true that the testimony of the Church was for a long time faithfully maintained after the administration of discipline was relaxed. But testimony was not sufficient in itself to develop moral power when the principles enunciated were not carried out in practice.

The facts are thus stated by authority :

The experience of more than half a century will afford us many important lights and landmarks, pointing out what is the safest and most prudent policy to be pursued in our onward course as regards African slavery in these states. . . . Rules have been made, from time to time, regulating the sale, purchase, and holding of slaves, which, upon the experience of the great difficulties of administering them, and the unhappy consequences both to master and servants, have been as often changed or repealed.\* The history of the Church shows this point indisputably, that the highest ground that has ever been held upon the subject was taken at the very organization of the Church; and that concessions have been made by the Church continually, from that time to this, in

\* Address of the Bishops, 1840.

view of the necessities of the South; that while the antislavery principle has never been abandoned, our rules have been made less and less stringent, and our language less and less severe. \*

The abandonment of the original ground occupied by the Methodist Episcopal Church prepared the way for more deplorable results. The Church for a time interposed her influence and her authority to suppress the agitation of the subject of slavery. The General Conference of 1836, by a vote of one hundred and twenty to fourteen, adopted a declaration of opposition "to modern abolitionism," and, besides, disclaimed "any right, wish, or intention to interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave, as it exists in the slave-holding states in this union." The Pastoral Address also, of the same year, deprecated the excitement caused by agitating the subject of slavery, and said, "The only safe, scriptural, and prudent way for us, both as ministers and people, to take, is wholly to refrain from this agitating subject."

The four years ensuing witnessed the most agitating discussion that had yet occurred. A small minority of Methodists who were abolitionists held conventions, published antislavery books, tracts, and periodicals, and sought to secure conference action against slavery. A large majority of the Northern Methodists were opposed to this agitation, and wished to conciliate the Southern Methodists, and prevent their threatened division of the Church. And to this all the official papers, with the entire episcopal board, agreed. Several annual conferences at the North and West construed the advice of the General Conference, "wholly to refrain from this agitating subject," to have the force of law. Participation in abolition movements was then decided to be "contumacy and insubordination." And the discipline of the Church was for a few years administered on this basis. For this cause private members were expelled, official members were removed, license was withheld from local preachers, young men were refused recommendation to the ministry, candidates were denied admission to annual conferences, ministers were dropped from the rolls, and elders were suspended from all the functions of the Christian ministry.

While the irrepressible agitation was thus being largely

\* Dr. Durbin's Speech, 1844.



increased by the efforts made to put it down, the General Conference of 1840 was held. Its action was in harmony with that of the General Conference of 1836. But it was the last of the retrograding series ; for here the downward tendency of the conservative element touched bottom. The ever-growing "necessities of the South" led the conference to sanction the action of the Missouri Annual Conference, which had charged a minister with maladministration for receiving the testimony of colored persons against white persons at a Church trial. The General Conference, also, by a vote of seventy-four to forty-six, declared, "That it is inexpedient and unjustifiable for any preacher among us to permit colored persons to give testimony against white persons in any state where they are denied that privilege in trials at law." But the most remarkable action was taken, in view of a memorial from Westmoreland, Virginia, which complained of the Baltimore Annual Conference for refusing to ordain local preachers who were slave-holders. A committee reported, and the General Conference adopted the following resolution :

That, under the provisional exception of the General Rules of the Church on the subject of slavery, the simple holding of slaves, or mere ownership of slave property, in states or territories where the laws do not admit of emancipation, and permit the liberated slave to enjoy freedom, constitutes no legal barrier to the election or ordination of ministers to the various grades of office known in the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and cannot, therefore, be considered as operating any forfeiture of right in view of such election and ordination.

The injustice of the discrimination thus made against the colored members of the Church, and these monstrous concessions in favor of slave-holders, were a great reproach, which deeply mortified, and subsequently awakened and aroused the Church to action. But it was also an exhibition of subserviency to the demands of the "infernal spirit of slavery," which for a time seemed to stupefy the people. And the authorized inaction of the Church, and the suppression of its old testimonies against slavery, made it appear almost shorn of its strength, a giant bare and bound in the presence of enemies. There was, however, even then, an immense antislavery force in process of development, which was afterward unfolded within and without the ecclesiastical lines.

This General Conference was succeeded by a season of profound peace in the Church, which was of short duration. It was the peace of despondency with one party, while to the other it was the complacency of a complete triumph. Nothing more remained to do for the conciliation of the South. And the friends of agitation of the subject of slavery saw little to gain by further effort.

Soon there was announced a secession from the Church on antislavery grounds, which was led off by Rev. O. Scott and others, and the organization of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America. These seceders assumed, that leaving the Church when they did, and for the causes assigned, and organizing another body, would give them a power to arouse the Methodist Episcopal Church to action against slavery, which they had not exerted within her pale during the previous years of agitation. Aside from this, or any other issue they made with the old Church, it is certain that they were an embodiment of primitive Methodistic antagonism to slavery. And their movements are necessarily within the scope of this review.

The Wesleyan Connection took away from the Methodist Episcopal Church less than twenty elders of the traveling ministry, and not over five thousand of its communicants. Their number increased to fifteen thousand in two years. This was mainly by conversions from the world, and by accessions from other bodies outside of the old Church. Incorporating, as they did, lay representation in their annual and general conferences, members were drawn to them from various denominations in large numbers, and the Wesleyans speedily became a body of great vigor and enterprise. Such is their view of their own history.

They vindicated zealously the claims of the Bible against the outrageous perversion which made its teachings justify American slavery under any circumstances. They preached "politics in the pulpit" twenty-five years ago, and denounced slave-holders and their apologists as fiercely as John Knox did popery. Their constitution forbade all distinctions in the rights and privileges of ministers and members on account of ancestry and color. They set forth in their Articles of Religion, (VII,) that "all men are bound so to order all their individual and

social and political acts as to secure to all men the enjoyment of every natural right." Their general rule forbade "the buying or selling of men, women, or children with an intention to enslave them, or holding them as slaves, or claiming that it is right so to do." And voting for a slave-holder was followed by expulsion from the connection. This was Methodism in earnest against slavery.

These movements outside of the Methodist Episcopal Church were antecedent to the great antislavery awakening within it. The actors therein claimed, and others less partial in their opinions agreed thereto, that these movements were causative as well as antecedent. It will be generally conceded, perhaps, that these movements were no hinderance to the conventional as well as conference action which soon became the usage of that Church on the question of slavery. And never had the antislavery discussion in the Church been so extensive and so determined as it was during the two years intervening between the organization of the Wesleyan Connection and the session of the General Conference of 1844.

When this body convened in New York it unexpectedly confronted the fact, that now, for the first time, the Church had a slave-holding bishop. And he was indorsed by nearly one half of the Church, including, as afterward appeared, the senior bishop, thirteen annual conferences, five thousand ministers, traveling and local, with nearly five hundred thousand members. His friends pleaded and protested, and threatened division if he was not let alone. But with this in full view, the conference, by a vote of one hundred and ten to sixty-eight, declared it as the sense of the body that the bishop should desist from the exercise of his office so long as he remained connected with slavery. And thence the movements were initiated which culminated in the great secession, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Besides this emphatic declaration to the friends of slavery that its encroachments must cease at once and forever, the conference went further. It sanctioned the suspension of a man from the ministry who refused to manumit his slaves. The vote stood one hundred and seventeen to fifty-six. And subsequently it rescinded the resolution of 1840 against receiving colored testimony, by a vote of one hundred and fifteen to

forty. And thus three important results were accomplished. A slave-holding bishop was rebuked; a slave-holding minister was suspended; and the reproach put on the colored people was removed. These were, in fact, waymarks indicating new points of departure in what was truly an "an onward course as regards African slavery in these states." \*

The General Conference of 1848, when asked by the new Church at the South to enter into fraternal relations with it, answered with a united voice, not one dissenting: "This General Conference does not consider it proper at present to enter into fraternal relations with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South." And the same body, by a similar vote, rescinded the resolutions of 1840 on the Westmoreland petition, and thereby annulled all its unfortunate concessions to slavery, which the Southern Church had used with damaging effect for years.

No specific action was taken on the subject of slavery in the General Conference of 1852. But during the discussions on conference boundaries, prominent men of the North, East, and West declared most emphatically that no more slave-holders were wanted in the Church; and that those who were yet in the Church were tolerated only, and not justified. One, who has since been chosen bishop, proposed a plan which refused admission to all slave-holders thereafter, and provided for the manumission of the slaves then held by members of the Church. And so the tide of Methodist antislavery sentiment indicated its rising power and swept steadily onward.

The four years ensuing were occupied with the most thorough discussion, through the official press and at the annual conferences, of the enormity of the evil of American slavery, the responsibility of the Church, and the duty of immediate action, condemnatory of all slave-holding by its membership. Twenty-nine annual conferences out of thirty-eight memorialized the General Conference of 1856 in favor of antislavery action. And the very large majority of antislavery delegates in that body, with the memorials committed to their hands, expressed unequivocally the voice of the Church on the subject of slavery.

The minority of that body, however, had on their side the

\* Bishops' Address, 1840.

restrictive rule, which required the concurrence of three fourths of the members of the annual conferences, with two thirds of all the members of the General Conference, to change the rule on slavery, and exclude slave-holders. No such concurrence had been secured. But the conference put on record a vote of one hundred and twenty-two yeas to ninety-six nays in favor of such a change.

The debate on slavery during this session of the General Conference was very ably conducted, and very elaborate. Several weeks were spent by the committee on slavery in preparing a report. Several days were occupied by members in public debate. And the antislavery disputants were some of the ablest ministers of the Church, who met their equals of the minority in a hard-fought, but triumphant contest. The law of the Church was not then changed, but the fact was demonstrated that its sentiment on the subject of slavery was completely revolutionized. Legally, slavery yet existed. Morally, it was doomed. Sentence of death was then pronounced upon it. For not only was the large vote recorded as above indicated, but a further expression was given to the will of the Church. The Book Agents and the Tract Society were instructed to publish antislavery books and tracts, thus officially branding slavery as a crime, and to be treated as such.

Four years more ensued. The antislavery action of the churches, the annual conferences, and the official press, was rapidly developing itself as a national power in favor of universal freedom. The spirit of the vast majority of the representatives of the Church was willing, but the will of a decreasing minority was yet too strong to change the letter of the law on slavery. Hopelessly defeated in debate, excluded from all places of distinction in the Church, and dwindling daily to the mere shadow of its former self, the minority of conservative men clung to the bare pole of a restrictive rule, and rallied grimly around that; so that the movement at the General Conference of 1860, for changing the law on slavery, failed by only four votes. As it was, the vote stood one hundred and thirty-eight yeas to seventy-four nays. This was a gain of thirty-eight votes by the antislavery men since the previous session of the same body. And as each vote represented a constituency of thirty ministers and over four thousand members,

the great increase of antislavery power is manifest, as, also, the greatness of the task of revolutionizing a Church of nearly one million members.

At this date the old antislavery testimony of the Church was promulgated, in all its primitive purity and power, by the adoption of a new chapter on slavery, in answer to the old question, too long neglected, "What shall be done for the extirpation of the evil of slavery?" Its language deserves to be copied in full. "*Answer*, We declare that we are as much as ever convinced of the great evil of slavery. We believe that the buying, selling, or holding of human beings, to be used as chattels, is contrary to the laws of God and nature, and inconsistent with the Golden Rule, and with that rule in our Discipline which requires all who desire to continue among us to 'do no harm,' and to 'avoid evil of every kind.' We therefore affectionately admonish all our preachers and people to keep themselves pure from this evil, and to seek its extirpation by all lawful and Christian means." And the vote on this action was one hundred and fifty-five yeas to fifty-eight nays, or nearly a three fourths vote.

Two years prior to this action a new Methodist force had been organized against slavery. The Northern annual conferences of the Methodist Protestant Church had for several years constituted an antislavery minority of that body. After long-continued, patient, and earnest labor with their Southern brethren, this minority withdrew and organized separately in 1858. They excluded all slave-holders, and removed all distinctions on account of color which had prevailed in the old Discipline.

At this period, therefore, there were three Methodist bodies at the North, moving in separate columns, on well-defined lines of action, toward the same objective point, against a common enemy, American slavery. These were, the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Wesleyan Methodist Connection, and the New Methodist Protestant Church. With each the movement had been the work of years. The first two bodies named were nearly co-etaneous in their antislavery labors; for the organization of the Wesleyans, and the newly awakened antislavery life of the old body, date back now nearly twenty-five years. The Protestants moved into line soon after.



And, however separate the path of their respective movements, or however diverse the measure of their power, they were now with accumulated forces rapidly converging to one grand goal, the overthrow of slavery. And thus, providentially in a very essential matter, the unity of American Methodism was already a fixed fact. It was now one grand antislavery army of three divisions.

Two of these bodies, by withdrawing from the majorities antagonist to their views, had easily secured a constitutional prohibition of slavery in their Discipline; while the Methodist Episcopal Church, doubtless influenced by their action, and impelled as well by sympathy with the generous civilization of the age, and by the benevolence of a common religious faith, had marshaled a vast majority of her communion in active hostility to slavery. And its number was more than tenfold greater than the entire united membership of both the other bodies, and was rapidly growing in power, equal to the task of enacting a constitutional prohibition of slavery for a Church of a million members.

Just at that time occurred the slave-holders' rebellion, which dug the graves of nearly three hundred thousand loyal men, and almost buried the government beneath their bodies. But it was not successful. The government still lives. Underlying its foundations are the patriot dead; and their memory will cement its unity and perpetuate its glory for many coming ages.

Among the specific agencies which contributed to this grand consummation, a prominent sphere must be allotted to Methodism. The primitive Wesleyan hostility to slavery, just now completely awakened and organized in the threefold family, presented an unbroken front, more than a million strong, whose praying force and voting force and shooting force all responded to the war cry, Death to slavery!

To assume this for Methodism is not to deny the power of, nor to displace, any other religious body from its position on the roll of honor. It is only designed to affirm that the absence of such a united, vigorous, tireless agency from the conflict as this was would have materially changed the history of the nation and the fate of American slavery. Without discriminating between the branches of the family of

Methodists, but regarding all as one Church, the explicit language of President Lincoln evidently is even more expressive than as originally applied: "The Methodist Church sends more soldiers to the field, more nurses to the hospitals, and more prayers to heaven, than any."

During the progress of the war the Methodist Episcopal General Conference of 1864 was held in Philadelphia. Here the long contest on the subject of slavery closed by the enactment of a law forbidding all "slave-holding, buying or selling slaves." The strength of the vote at three successive General Conferences was as follows: In 1856, yeas 122, nays 96. In 1860, yeas 138, nays 74. In 1864, yeas 207, nays 9. The concurrence of the three fourths vote in the annual conferences during the year 1865 established constitutionally, as the law of the Church, that which had been the clearly ascertained will of the majority many years before.

From this date the platform of American Methodists was a unit on the great question of human rights, as their vindication of the integrity of the institutions of freedom had been one in the alignments of the battle-field. And the most natural sequel to this record is the facts which have since transpired.

In June, 1865, the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church met at Erie, and issued a circular letter. They said that the relation of that Church to slavery now was such that "a general union of all Methodists who agree in doctrine, and who are loyal to the government and opposed to slavery," was practicable and desirable in the judgment. And they added with special significance that "we consider that the great cause which led to the separation from us of the Wesleyan Methodists of this country has passed away." And all Methodists were invited to unite in the Centenary celebrations of 1866.

A convention of non-episcopal Methodists was held at Cincinnati in May, 1866, which officially recognized these suggestions, and appointed their president, with two others, a committee, who addressed the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church in relation thereto, and received a reply, signed personally by every member of the episcopal board.

In January, 1867, an informal conference of Wesleyan ministers and laymen was held at Adrian, Mich. They issued

"A Calm Appeal" in favor of returning to the Methodist Episcopal Church, which was published in their official paper, "The American Wesleyan." Four months later, three of the same ministers issued a "Fraternal Greeting" to their ministerial associates, more than fifty of whom had signified their purpose to accept the invitation of the bishops, as above indicated, and for the reasons they suggested. And other movements are progressing of which it is not proper, and perhaps not possible, to speak fully at this time. They all evidence a tendency toward repairing completely the breach made in the ranks of American Methodism by American slavery.

The downfall of slavery has removed barriers to Christian effort on this great continent hitherto impassable. Through this opening to new fields of missionary enterprise the men and the money of the Methodist Episcopal Church have been pressed forward promptly and in large measure. Its press and pulpit are united in the labor of vindicating human rights, righteous government, political equality, and the spread of scriptural holiness over these lands. Already has its action challenged the admiration of the nation, and awakened emulation in other religious bodies, as well as secured very marked recognitions of divine favor.

With clean papers in the hands of her officers, the old ship now clears from port, homeward bound, with all sails set, on an open sea. Freightened as she is with the interests of millions, whose earthly happiness and heavenly joy are periled or secured by failure or success, all pious hearts will pray, God, bring her safely to the landing on the other shore, with a full cargo of precious jewels for his kingdom and his crown.

**ART. VII.—THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN CANADA.\***

## [ARTICLE FIRST.]

THE Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada, "no less the child of Providence" than the parent body in the United States, has a history replete with thrilling adventure, and with the righteous deeds of heroic men. Her history, therefore, if properly written, cannot fail to interest the devout reader in every clime.

Several of the Irish Palatines, who, under God, were the founders of Methodism in New York, were also the founders of Methodism in Canada. About the year 1769 Philip Embury and family left the city of New York, and located themselves at Ashgrove, within the bounds of the present Troy Conference. They were followed, in 1770 or 1771, by Paul and Barbara Heck, their three sons, and several others of the New York society. Here, again, as in New York, Embury established a class, and held meetings among the people; but having injured himself mowing, he died suddenly in 1773.

In 1774, in consequence of the evidently approaching revolutionary storm, Paul and Barbara Heck, with their three sons, John Lawrence, who had married the Widow Embury, David Embury, brother to Philip, and many more of the Irish Palatines from Ashgrove emigrated to Lower Canada, and stopped for a time near Montreal. Not being pleased with that section of the country, however, they removed in 1778 to Augusta, in Upper Canada. David Embury, with several of his friends, subsequently settled along the Bay of Quinté, where many of their descendants still live.

The first Methodist society in Canada was formed in Augusta, as nearly as can be ascertained, in 1778, and had among its first members Paul and Barbara Heck, their sons

\* We have given in a previous Quarterly a history of that branch of Canadian Methodism which stands in connection with the Methodism of England. We now give a history of the branch styling itself "The Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada." Both branches have been recognized by our General Conference as true members of the Methodist family. We would trust that the time is not distant when old differences may be forgotten, and the two may become one.—Ed.

John, Jacob, and Samuel, John and Catharine Lawrence—Mrs. Lawrence had been Philip Embury's widow—and Samuel Embury, son of Philip, with such others of the little band of emigrants as felt it a privilege to unite with the class. Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence opened their house as a place of worship, and Samuel Embury was appointed leader. Here, indeed, was a "church in the wilderness." Paul Heck died in 1792 and Barbara Heck in 1804. They both sleep near the "Old Blue Church in the front of Augusta."

In Lower Canada Methodism had its origin in Quebec in 1780. At this period a regiment of British troops, known as the 44th, was stationed in that city. Among these soldiers was one of Mr. Wesley's local preachers named Tuffey, who was commissary of the regiment, and who, it is evident, had considerable influence among his fellow-soldiers, which he used for their benefit, preaching and explaining the word of God to all who would listen to him. There is no record, however, that Mr. Tuffey founded any permanent society among either soldiers or citizens, and soon after the termination of the Revolutionary war the 44th was disbanded, and Mr. Tuffey returned to Europe with several of the officers and men; while others having received grants of land settled in the country. After the disbanding of the 44th regiment little or nothing was known of Methodism in Quebec for many years.

On the 7th of October, 1786, Mr. George Neal, a school-teacher and local preacher, crossed the Niagara River into Canada, at Queenston.

Mr. Neal was born in Pennsylvania,\* February 28, 1751, but while still young he removed to North Carolina. He also resided at different times in South Carolina and Georgia. In the latter state he was appointed captain of a company in the British service, to which cause he adhered throughout the war of the Revolution. He was soon promoted to a majorship, and was present in several engagements; but he suffered most severely at the siege of Charleston, where he very narrowly

\* Several Methodist writers state that Mr. Neal was an Irishman by birth. This, however, is a mistake. The writer of these pages has been at some pains to ascertain accurately the facts respecting Mr. Neal's early history, by examining that gentleman's own private papers, which he was kindly permitted to do by Mrs. Hutchinson, Mr. Neal's youngest daughter, who had them in possession. The above statements respecting Mr. Neal are taken from his own private papers.

escaped with his life. Defeat following defeat, Mr. Neal saw that the British cause was lost, and being cut off from the royal forces, he with difficulty made his way into Maryland, where he commenced teaching school. Here he became acquainted with the Methodist people, and for the first time heard a Methodist preacher—Rev. Hope Hull—whom Dr. Stevens calls “the Summerfield of the time.” Mr. Neal was awakened under the powerful discourses of this “young and eloquent” itinerant, and was soon after soundly converted. He became a local preacher, and for a time labored as a supply on the Pee Dee circuit. Finally, however, he came, at the time above stated, to Canada, and settled in the Niagara district, where he again taught school.

Mr. Neal suffered no little persecution from those in high places after he came to this province; he was arrested for preaching to his fellow-settlers, and given the alternative of desisting from this work or being banished from the country. He refused to obey man in this respect, and the day was fixed for his banishment; but in the midst of his trouble, his chief persecutor died suddenly, and he was allowed to continue in the province, and to preach without further molestation.

The second Methodist class in Canada was organized by Mr. Neal, in the township of Stamford, in 1790, Christian Warner being appointed leader, an office which he continued to fill for forty-four years. The brave old local preacher, and the earnest, pious leader, both died long years ago, and have, with many of their associates, entered into their eternal rest.

A few of Mr. Neal's pupils still linger on the shores of time, and quite a number are still living who, when they were young, listened to him as he published the glad tidings of salvation in the great congregation. In his day he was eminently useful, both as an instructor of youth and as a minister of righteousness, and though he rests, his works follow him.

In 1788 Mr. Lyons, a school-teacher and exhorter from the United States, came to Adolphustown, and following the example of his brethren of those days, sent out appointments wherever it was practicable, collecting the scattered inhabitants together upon the Sabbath for worship, either in the



little log school-houses—the only public edifices there were—or in the private dwellings of the settlers; and, where this was found to be impracticable, he, after his school-hours were over, not unfrequently went miles into the still wilder wilderness, searching for the “lost sheep of the house of Israel,” exhorting sinners to become reconciled to God, and establishing believers in righteousness. Under his appeals stout-hearted sinners were awakened, frequently falling down before the Lord, and crying out in anguish of spirit, “Men and brethren, what must we do to be saved?” and very many, indeed, rejoiced in the “words of this salvation.”

About the time that Mr. Lyons came to Canada, or shortly afterward, Mr. James M'Carty, an Irishman who had been living in the United States, resolved to make his home in this country, and settled on the Bay of Quinté. Mr. M'Carty had been converted under the preaching of Mr. Whitefield, and feeling that a dispensation of the Gospel had been committed to him, he co-operated with Mr. Lyons and the Methodists along the Bay, preaching as he had opportunity. It is said that he wrote out his sermons in full, and read them to his congregation with great effect.

The same intolerant spirit, however, that caused Mr. Neal to be arrested at Niagara because he preached Christ to the people, prevailed at Kingston. Certain men “clothed with a little brief authority,” and actuated by State Church principles, decided that none but the “regular clergy” should be teachers of religion in Canada, and consequently the progress of Methodism should be stopped. Accordingly, Mr. M'Carty was arrested and cast into prison, and his wife and friends forbidden to see him, or administer to his wants. A humane Irishwoman, however, hearing of the sad condition of the prisoner, prevailed upon Judge Cartwright to allow her to supply him with food. At length Mr. M'Carty was tried under an edict for the banishment of “vagabond offenders,” and was sentenced to banishment on one of the Thousand Islands in the St. Lawrence. The prisoner was removed from the judgment-hall of these *mighty potentates*, and given into the charge of four Frenchmen, who were ordered to execute the sentence; but as the boat which was to convey him to his destination moved smoothly out upon the placid waters,

M'Carty addressed them in their own language, and drew such a picture of his own condition, the destitution of his family, left without any one to support them, and of the tyranny of those who persecuted him for following the dictates of his own conscience, that his guards were moved to compassion, and dropping down the river till they were out of view of Kingston—where those *humane gentlemen* (?) who formed the council which had sentenced him dwelt—they landed him again upon the main land, whence he returned once more to his wife and family, and to the society of his Christian friends. But, alas! his respite from persecution was short. On the following Sabbath, while Mr. M'Carty was preaching in the house of Mr. Robert Perry, an officer and three men, all armed, entered, and again arrested him. He was taken once more to Kingston, and thrown into the *cells*. He was again tried, and this time sentenced to transportation to the United States, and so faithfully was the sentence carried out that he disappeared, never again to be seen by his family, or the congregations to whom he used to minister upon the Bay of Quinté. How he went was never known. His persecutors stated that he left the province by way of Montreal; but their testimony was not considered reliable, and of course there were many rumors concerning his disappearance. A Mr. Sherwood stated that shortly after Mr. M'Carty's trial the persecuted man went to the States and secured a home for his family, that he, Sherwood, saw M'Carty in Montreal on his way after his wife and children, and that after he had reached a place on the St. Lawrence called the "Cedars," he was found dead in the woods near the road, having been stabbed in several places. The above facts, concerning Mr. M'Carty's fate, the writer received from Mr. John M'Carty, of Cobourg, son of the martyred man.

"The blood of the saints" has in all ages been "the seed of the Church." Although Mr. M'Carty thus fell a martyr to the cause of Christ, the work moved gloriously on; and that he, who had by ruthless persecution been separated from the little band of pilgrims in the wilderness, had "passed through death triumphant home" became the conviction of all who had worshiped with him. Mr. Robert Perry and others were raised up to assist Mr. Lyons in his work, and the "common people heard them gladly."

In 1790 Mr. William Losee, of the New York Conference, who had in 1789 been appointed to the Champlain circuit as junior preacher with David Kendall, not having succeeded well in his field of labor, received permission from his presiding elder, Rev. Freeborn Garrettson, to come into Canada and visit his relatives along the Bay of Quinté, doubtless with the hope of opening a new field of usefulness. Mr. Losee crossed the St. Lawrence into Lower Canada, and came up the river, preaching at Augusta and at other places until he reached the townships along the Bay. Here he halted, and spent some weeks preaching to the settlers. Lyons and M'Carty, with their associates, had been preparing the way before Mr. Losee's arrival, and when it was known that he was in their vicinity, and would deliver "a message from God to them," the people came from far and near to hear him, some with "ox sleds," bringing their wives and little ones, and others, at night, on foot, carrying torches to light them on their way, and returning in the same manner, illuminating the dark forests, and making them re-echo the jubilant songs of Zion. By the time Mr. Losee had reached Adolphustown the people felt that a new era had dawned upon the country, and they "thanked God and took courage."

Mr. Losee could only remain a short time with his friends, as it was necessary he should return to his own country before the ice should leave the rivers; but before he left petitions were given to him, signed by the people in and about the Niagara and Midland districts, which he was requested to present to the New York Conference, urging that a missionary should be sent to Canada. In consequence of these petitions, and of the favorable report given by Mr. Losee, Mr. Asbury was induced to send Mr. Losee to Kingston in 1791. At the conference of 1792 Mr. Losee returned one hundred and sixty-five members under the head of Cataraqui, instead of Kingston, as there was another circuit of the same name as the latter in the United States. Whether this estimate included the societies at Augusta and Stamford, or either of them, cannot now be determined.

The first class established by Mr. Losee, and the third organized in the province, was formed on the Kingston circuit on the 20th of February, 1791. He organized his second society on

the following Sabbath, and his third on the 2d of March, the day on which Mr. Wesley died. The work in Canada may now be said to have been fairly commenced. Mr. Losee was a plain and powerful preacher, and frequently very pointed in his remarks to the ungodly. It is related of him that on one occasion, when preaching at Hay Bay, a powerful man who had at different times disturbed religious worship entered the assembly, and began as usual to annoy all those who were near him by his irreverent scoffing. Mr. Losee for some time continued preaching without appearing to notice the disturber, but waxing warmer and more eloquent as he proceeded. At length, when the scoffer had passed all bounds, the minister suddenly paused, and fixing his dark, piercing eye upon the man, and at the same time pointing his finger directly at him, said in an exceedingly solemn manner, "O, Lord, smite him!" "Amen," heartily responded some of the worshipers. The amens had scarcely died away when again, with still greater emphasis than before, Mr. Losee pronounced the same words, "O, Lord, smite him!" Amen, again rang through the congregation. The offender leaped to his feet to leave the place, but before he had taken the first step the preacher once more cried out at the top of his voice, "O, LORD, SMITE HIM!" and at the same instant down the man fell, as though he had been shot. The scene which followed may be more readily imagined than described. Sinners trembled and wept, prayer and praise became general among believers; it was indeed a time of power. The man, as soon as he fell, had begun to call on God for mercy, and thus he who had come "to mock remained to pray," and was some time after added to the "number of the disciples." In this manner the word grew and multiplied in the land.

In 1792, in consequence of the favorable statements of Mr. Losee, and also in conformity to the wishes of the people, the New York Conference was induced to send other preachers to Canada. The circuits were set down in the Minutes thus: "Cataraqui, Darius Dunham; Oswegatchie, William Losee." These charges were within the bounds of the Albany district, Freeborn Garretson, presiding elder. Cataraqui was the name of a small stream running into the Bay of Quinté, above Kingston; Oswegatchie was the name of another stream, and

was so called from an Indian village, situated where Ogdensburg now stands.

After a tedious journey of many days' traveling across the state of New York, much of it then a howling wilderness, the weary itinerants reached their destination—Earnesttown, and gave out that they would hold a quarterly meeting on Saturday, 15th, and Sunday 16th September. The presiding elder could not be with them, but as Mr. Dunham was an elder, and Losee a deacon, they were qualified to administer the sacraments of the Church.

The news of Mr. Losee's return, and of the arrival of Mr. Dunham, together with the announcement of the quarterly meeting and love-feast, the first meeting of the kind ever held in the province, on the following Sabbath, filled many of the people with delight. Messengers were sent to the neighboring townships to herald the joyful intelligence, and the people flocked to the meeting in a manner similar to the Israelites of old when they gathered to the "feast of tabernacles."

On Saturday the usual religious services and the business meeting were held, and were well attended. The quarterly prayer-meeting was established, and the Holy Spirit rested on the assembly. God was in the midst of his children, preparing them for the duties of the approaching morning.

The Sabbath dawned. It was a memorable day. At an early hour the members and other serious persons repaired to Mr. Parrot's barn to attend the love-feast, where they spoke together of God's kind dealings toward them, and for the first time many of them partook of the sacrament, and presented their children for baptism. Love-feast and sacrament over, the doors were thrown open, and crowds of people who had been collecting during the morning entered the barn, and Mr. Dunham preached with energy and effect, followed by Mr. Losee with a powerful exhortation. The hearts of the assembly were moved by these servants of God as the "leaves of the forests are moved by the gentle winds of heaven," and many went out from the first quarterly meeting in Canada not only almost, but altogether persuaded to be Christians.

Losee and Dunham now resolved to separate, and Mr. Losee bade adieu to the societies he had gathered the first year, and hastened on to Oswegatchie, his new circuit, leaving Mr. Dun-

ham to take charge of the work on the Bay of Quinté. Both were successful, as their returns to the next conference show. Losee returned from Oswegatchie ninety, Dunham from Bay of Quinté two hundred and fifty-five, the latter name having been substituted for Cataragui. There does not seem to have been any appointment made to Canada for 1793, though it is evident that Dunham and Losee both remained at their work, as there were returns for that year. There had been an increase on the Oswegatchie, and a small decrease on the Bay of Quinté, the total being three hundred and thirty-four.

In 1794 Canada was set off as a separate district. Darius Dunham, presiding elder, James Coleman and Elijah Wolsey were circuit preachers. This arrangement, however, did not continue long. Next year the Canadian work was placed under the charge of John Merrick, who had the oversight of a very large district in the neighboring country. The Bay of Quinté circuit had enlarged so much in 1795 that S. Keeler was sent to assist Mr. Wolsey. Mr. Dunham was this year appointed to Niagara, where Mr. Neal had already formed a class about five years before any regular help reached them, excepting it might be now and then an occasional visit from some of the brethren who had traveled on the Bay of Quinté charge. Upon his arrival Mr. Dunham found a membership of sixty-five persons, but does not appear to have been very successful in his labors, as he reports a decrease of one. But Mr. Dunham could not have been considered remiss in discharge of duty by Bishop Asbury, as the conference of 1796 again set off Canada as a separate district, and Mr. Dunham was appointed presiding elder; preachers, S. Coat, H. E. Wooster, and James Coleman.

The Methodist Church of those days as well as at present occasionally suffered loss. In 1793 and in 1795 there was a slight decrease in membership, but with these exceptions the cause steadily advanced up to the commencement of the present century, at which time there was one district, comprising four circuits, with a membership of nine hundred and thirty-six, and seven preachers.

The hardships endured by these early Methodist preachers can scarcely be realized in these days of improvement. New York, or sometimes Philadelphia, was their starting-point.



From thence they were obliged to travel on foot or on horseback, in many cases for hundreds of miles, through the wilderness, with nothing but an Indian trail for a path. Broad, deep rivers were to be crossed, and a circuit made round dangerous swamps, and when night came down upon the travelers they must make the best of their circumstances and camp out. Traveling by steamboat was an idea entertained only by the visionary enthusiast, and railroads and telegraphs had not even been dreamed of.

The conference of 1796 was held in New York, commencing September 30. This year the Messrs. H. C. Wooster and S. Coat volunteered for the Canadian work. Before reaching their destination these missionaries endured fearful hardships, being twenty-one days on their journey from the conference to Canada, obtaining lodging as they might in the few scattered log-cabins, or where there were none, camping out. During this journey the missionaries at times really suffered for food. The quarterly meeting on the Bay of Quinté circuit was about being held when they arrived there. In a prayer-meeting on Saturday afternoon, conducted by Mr. Wooster, a most remarkable revival of religion commenced among the people. While engaged in singing and prayer the Holy Spirit descended on the members, and several of them fell, overwhelmed with that

"Sacred awe that dares not move,  
And all the silent heaven of love,"

while others shouted halleluiahs, or sang glad anthems of praise. Awakened sinners were crying for mercy, each intent on his own salvation, and the tide of feeling seemed surging on like the rush of mighty waters, when the presiding elder, who had gone with Mr. Coat and the stewards to a neighboring house to attend to the finances of the circuit, heard the noise, and hastened to the place of worship to put a stop to the confusion. As he entered the place, however, he was struck with the deep solemnity which seemed to rest upon the assembly, and kneeling down among the worshipers he began praying silently for direction and guidance. As he knelt thus he heard Mr. Wooster whisper out, "God bless Brother Dunham, God bless Brother Dunham," when down went the elder prostrate on the floor, with those of the slain of the Lord who

were already there, but soon arose to shout and praise God as fervently as any of his brethren. From this meeting the reformation spread into every part of the province where the Methodist preachers visited the settlements, and hundreds were converted and added to the Church. The latter part of 1796, and the beginning of 1797, form a memorable era in our Church history.

- In 1800 Daniel Pickett was admitted on trial, and sent to the Ottawa, or Grand River country, as it was then called, to break up new ground. The Ottawa, though a wild, remote region, had even then an enterprising though scattered population, some of whom were Methodists, or were favorable to the connection. Mr. Pickett was well received, and was moderately successful, returning to the conference next year forty-five members; but as he had had a hard year, Bishop Asbury appointed him at this conference to the Bay of Quinté, a better, but not less responsible circuit.

Two years later another young man, who was afterward distinguished as an able minister of Christ both in Canada and the United States, entered the ministerial ranks. Nathan Bangs was converted in Canada, and was admitted into the New York Conference on trial in 1802, and traveled in this province for seven years, one of which he traveled under the presiding elder. In 1812 he was appointed to the Lower Canada district, but did not go to his work in consequence of the breaking out of the war. His physical and mental energies were both sometimes severely taxed during his long and weary travels, and temptations assailed him on every side. Though feeling it his duty to preach, he trembled at the responsibility resting on him, and at times almost sank under it. On one occasion becoming disheartened he left his circuit, flying Jonah-like from the presence of the Lord, till he was stopped by the ice breaking up in the Grand River near where Brantford now stands. Reflection convinced him that he had been laboring under temptation, and that it would be wrong to leave his charge; accordingly he retraced his steps and labored with greater diligence and zeal than before, and with much more success.

Seven years of toil, and the illness induced by the miasma of the swamps of an uncleared country began to tell upon his

constitution, and fearing that he could not stand the work in Canada, he expressed a wish to be allowed to return to his native land, and was accordingly appointed to Delaware in 1808; and in a very few years rose to eminence in the connection.

In 1828, after the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada had, by consent of the American General Conference, become an independent body; Dr. Bangs was invited to become our bishop, but declined: a step he afterward regretted, as it might—doubtless would—have prevented the unhappy secession of 1833.

In 1805 two other men, who were afterward quite distinguished, and eminently useful in the Church, came to the province, namely, Henry Ryan and William Case. They were both appointed to the same circuit, Bay of Quinté. Mr. Ryan had been admitted in 1800; Mr. Case was admitted this year. In 1827 Mr. Ryan withdrew from the connection, and in 1829 organized a new body called Canadian Wesleyans; and Mr. Case, in 1833, went with the union party, who at that time became subject to the British Conference. Both these men spent the most of their days in Canada, and died in the country they loved, and for which they had labored.

From 1791 to 1812 the work in Canada had been regularly and satisfactorily supplied by ministers who, at the call of Bishop Asbury, volunteered to come to this remote wilderness, that they might instruct the people in the way of righteousness. Bishop Asbury was interested in the success of the Canadian cause, and had long hoped to visit at least a portion of the societies in this country; but did not succeed in doing so till the 3d of July, 1811, when he crossed the St. Lawrence, and passing up from Cornwall to Kingston, he preached at various places, beholding with delight the prosperous condition of the societies, and the willingness of the people generally to hear the word. Of the inhabitants he said, "My soul is much united to them." Respecting the townships through which he passed he makes this record: "Our ride has brought us through one of the finest countries I have ever seen; the timber is of a noble size; the cattle are well-shaped and well-looking; the crops are abundant, on a most fruitful soil. Surely this is a land that God the Lord hath blessed."

The Upper Canada district was in 1810 placed under the

direction of the Genesee Conference, Lower Canada remaining with the New York Conference till 1812, when the whole Canadian work was placed within the bounds of the Genesee Conference, such an arrangement being more convenient for all the parties concerned.

The New York Conference of 1812 met at Albany, Dr. Bangs says, on the 5th of June, though it was advertised in the Minutes for the 4th, and the Genesee Conference met at Niagara July 23. Statistics for this year were as follows, namely: two districts, eleven circuits, eighteen preachers, members two thousand eight hundred and forty-five.

The New York and Genesee Conferences assembled in 1812 under a pressure of great anxiety respecting their Canadian brethren. President Madison, in his message to Congress, June 1, 1812, four days before the meeting of the New York Conference, had recommended immediate war with Great Britain. Congress acquiesced, and on the 18th war was formally declared. This news reached Quebec on the 24th, and Little York, Upper Canada, on the 26th. In consequence of this proclamation the Canadian government issued an order that "all American citizens should leave the country by the 3d day of July, 1812."

This decree was to go into effect just twenty days before the meeting of the Genesee Conference, and before most of the preachers appointed by the New York Conference could reach Lower Canada. It is necessary to state this in order to understand what follows.

Appointments to Lower Canada were as follows, namely: Lower Canada district, Nathan Bangs, presiding elder; Montreal, Nathan Bangs; Quebec, Thomas Burch; Ottawa, Robert Hibbard; St. Francis River, Samuel Luckey, J. F. Chamberlain. Mr. Hibbard was drowned the same year while attempting to cross the St. Lawrence, and Mr. Burch went to supply the place of Mr. Bangs at Montreal, where he was permitted to remain, as he was a British subject. It was not considered safe for the other brethren to come to the province in consequence of the proclamation.

At the Genesee Conference the following appointments were made for Upper Canada: Upper Canada district, Henry Ryan, presiding elder; Augusta, J. Rhodes, E. Cooper, S.

Hopkins; Bay of Quinté, Isaac B. Smith, J. Reynolds; Smith's Creek, Thomas Whitehead; Young-street, Joseph Gatchell; Niagara, Andrew Prindle, Ninian Holmes; Ancaster and Long Point, Enoch Burdock, Peter Covenhoven; Detroit, George W. Densmore. As Detroit could be supplied from the American side, Mr. Densmore chose to stay in Canada. The preachers who remained in the province during the war were, H. Ryan, T. Whitehead, John Reynolds, A. Prindle, E. Burdock, G. W. Densmore, and David Culp, who had been called out by the presiding elder. Mr. Neal assisted as a local preacher in the Niagara country, and Daniel Pickett, although he had located, helped to fill the appointments on the Bay of Quinté circuit, and Mr. Dunham, too, assisted as he was able; and in addition to these, the regular ministers, there were several local preachers scattered here and there through the societies who rendered very valuable services. Thus it will be seen that the people were not as destitute of the Gospel as was represented at the time when the Wesleyan missionaries came out, and unsettled, and in many cases divided, the societies, giving as their reason the religious destitution of the provinces during the war, though the obvious cause was political prejudice against American Methodists. In effect, they really denied the right of American ministers to preach to British subjects. So far does political rancor carry even wise and good men. For these interferences there was no other cause than political prejudices. The ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church were as loyal as any other class of his majesty's subjects. But still further to remove every or any doubt respecting the course to be pursued by American ministers under foreign governments, the General Conference of 1820 adopted the following disciplinary rule:

As far as it respects civil affairs, we believe it is the duty of all Christians, and especially all Christian ministers, to be subject to the supreme authority of the country where they may reside, and to use all laudable means to enjoin obedience to the powers that be; and therefore it is expected that all our preachers and people who may be under the British or any other government will behave themselves as peaceable and orderly subjects.—*American Discipline*, page 26.

Where the preachers were unable to come to their circuits, or were obliged to leave those they were on, because of the

war, Mr. Ryan supplied the vacancies as best he could with the help at his disposal, and thus did much to preserve the Church from the sad effects of the war.

The Canadian Methodists being now cut off from all communication with their brethren in the United States, Mr. Ryan called a conference of those preachers who remained in the country, which met at the house of Mr. Benjamin Corwin, near Lundy's Lane, Mr. Ryan occupying the chair, and having associated with him Thomas Whitehead, A. Prindle, John Reynolds, E. Burdock, E. Petty, and J. Rhodes. D. Culp, who was traveling under the presiding elder, was also present. After due consultation Mr. Ryan appointed the preachers to their respective fields of labor, and they went apparently as cheerfully as though they had been appointed by Bishop Asbury. It is very much to be regretted that the journals were not fully preserved.

In the summer of 1814 Mr. Ryan again called his little band to meet him in conference "at the Sixth Town Meeting-House," and again appointed them to their various charges; and in this manner kept the work supplied until peace was declared, after the treaty of Ghent, December 24, 1814.

There were two most unjustifiable charges urged against the American ministers by high-church and state politicians which never were substantiated, and which the conduct of the Canadian Methodists proved to be untrue during the struggle of 1812. The first of these was, that the American preachers taught their people disloyalty to the British government, and consequently they were dangerous to the public peace. The second, that the American preachers had no regard for their flocks, or they would never have left them in the hour of danger and fled to the United States. *g—t* The maligners altogether ignoring the fact that the proclamation compelled those who were not British subjects to go, whether they wished to or not.

It was through these and kindred misrepresentations that some were led to encourage the coming of the British missionaries, which resulted in the division of several of the societies; and others, after the war, were by the same means induced to agitate for a separation of the Canadian Methodists from the parent body.

The war being ended, it was hoped that the Genesee Con-



ference would now be able to fill all the stations with suitable ministers, and that the societies would soon enjoy their wonted peace and prosperity. In this, however, the Church was mournfully disappointed. The Wesleyans of England had sent out ministers during the war, and these men now set up claims of superior loyalty, and going into the old congregations and long-established classes, created strife and contention in many of the societies where hitherto there had been only peace and amity. In all this they pleaded as excuse for their conduct that it was not proper for the Methodists in Canada to be under any foreign ecclesiastical superintendence, though at the same time the British Conference, quite justifiably, was sending *its missionaries into foreign countries* wherever there was any opening whatever. This fact, however, was studiously kept out of sight both by these missionaries and by the home and provincial governments, by which they were urged on in their attempts to subvert the original Methodist societies.

The reason of the conduct of the governments, both home and provincial, was obvious. The Methodist Episcopal Church was as a body opposed to any established Church, or, indeed, any union of Church and State in the colonies, while the Wesleyans of England in those days were not, considering themselves to be, as Mr. Alder afterward said, "a branch of the Church of England, both at home and abroad."

Notwithstanding all these difficulties with which the Church had to contend, the preachers and most of the members remained warmly attached to the original connection, and in Upper Canada the societies and congregations steadily increased. Suitable places of worship were erected in many places, and the power of God attended the preaching of the word.

The year 1817 was the most remarkable for religious revivals that had yet taken place in the country. The Genesee Conference held its session this year in Elizabethtown, Upper Canada, commencing June 21, 1817, Bishop George presiding. An annual conference in Canada was a new and strange thing. The people anxiously awaited the day on which it was to commence, anticipating with delight and pleasure a visit from the bishop and the ministers, at the same time praying devoutly for and *expecting* a great revival. Not only did they pray for the descent of the Holy Spirit on themselves and the confer-

ence, but that particular individuals might be awakened and converted, and it resulted according to their faith.

where Among others who were named was a young man from Delaware county, in the state of New York, who resided not far from the place, the conference was to meet. The young man was moral and upright in his deportment, but being a strong Calvinist, and having listened to the misrepresentations of the enemies of Methodists, he not only considered their manner of worship very objectionable, but greatly disliked them as a people. Before he left the paternal home he had been warned to shun the *Methodists*, as it was thought there was a demoniacal influence about their preaching. For a long time he adhered to this advice, and refused to hear a Methodist minister; but shortly before the conference he was persuaded to attend their meetings a few times. Not seeing anything objectionable in these meetings, he concluded that the Methodists in Canada were unlike the Methodists in the States, and that he might, therefore, with perfect safety attend their meetings. He frequented the meetings held in connection with the conference, and before it adjourned was converted, became himself a Methodist preacher, and was admitted into the Genesee Conference at the session held in 1820 at Lundy's Lane, having been employed by the presiding elder the previous year. The young man has grown old in years and in labors, but the scenes of the conference of 1817 continue green in his memory. In the seventy-second year of his age and forty-eighth of his ministry, Rev. PHILANDER SMITH, D.D., *senior bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada*, still lives a life of usefulness, the fruit of earnest, importunate, faithful prayer. Bishop Smith is the oldest Methodist minister in Canada *now effective*.

The programme of the Sabbath services of that conference may not be uninteresting. The religious services commenced at eight o'clock in the morning, and lasted with but little intermission till eight at night. There were five sermons preached and several exhortations delivered. Bishop George delivered a most powerful discourse, and it is thought that over one hundred souls were awakened, and led to seek salvation at this conference or immediately after its close. The revival spread from the conference to most of the western circuits, and during

its continuance it is estimated by Dr. Bangs that over one thousand souls were awakened and brought to Christ.

In 1820 there were in connection with the Methodist Church in this country two districts, seventeen circuits, twenty-six preachers, and five thousand five hundred and fifty-seven members.

This year the General Conference met at Baltimore, and Canadian affairs were introduced at an early period. Petitions had been sent from Canada asking the continuance of the American preachers, praying for an annual conference, and complaining of the unseemly conduct of the British missionaries. Bishops George and Roberts brought the question before the conference verbally. The whole subject was carefully considered, and the Rev. John Emory delegated to the British Conference to try, if possible, to come to a proper understanding with the English body. A communication was sent from the same conference to the members in Canada, assuring them that the preachers they solicited should be continued. It was proposed by the General Conference to the British Conference, through Mr. Emory, that the British missionaries should remain in Lower Canada, while the American ministers continued to occupy Upper Canada, as it was thought this course would give general satisfaction.

To this proposition the British Conference at the time honorably and with apparent cheerfulness consented. The American bishops and preachers faithfully carried out their part of the agreement, but unhappily the English missionaries did not, as, in violation of their own solemn compact, they continued to occupy Kingston, one of the most important towns in the province.

In reference to this the General Conference of 1824 passed the following resolution :

That a respectful representation be made to the British Conference of those points in the late agreement between the two connections which have not, on the part of their missionaries, been fulfilled.

What was accomplished, however, put a stop to contention, and for a time, at least, the Church had a comparative degree of prosperity.

This state of quietude did not long continue; other clouds began to gather over the ecclesiastical horizon. The Genesee Conference of 1823 did not elect Rev. H. Ryan to the General Conference of 1824, at which he took great offense. Mr. Ryan had held the office of presiding elder ever since 1810, and had attended two General Conferences, and these facts, connected with his age and the arduous labors he had undergone, entitled him, he thought, to the office of delegate. Mr. Ryan was a good speaker, and had been indeed in labors very abundant, consequently he was very popular among the membership, and in this his great strength lay; but in some instances he was arbitrary with his preachers, and he was headstrong and obstinate. Although not elected to the General Conference he determined to attend it, and a convention having been called by parties who encouraged him in *his* scheme of separation, Mr. Ryan and a Mr. Breckenridge, an influential local preacher on the Elizabethtown circuit, were appointed delegates extraordinary to the Baltimore Conference. These gentlemen took with them numerous signed petitions, independent of the petitions taken by the regular delegates, praying for an *immediate* separation from the American body. This irregular delegation could not, of course, be acknowledged by the conference, which Mr. Ryan ought to have realized before he left Canada. Its rejection, however, greatly displeased Mr. Ryan, and created much sympathy with him where the matter was not understood, and where his palpable inconsistency was not perceived in strenuously opposing lay delegation in Canada, and at the same time bringing a layman from a lay convention, and asking for him as well as himself a seat in the conference. These brethren were treated with the utmost courtesy, and allowed to appear before the Committee on Canadian Affairs, which quite satisfied Mr. Breckenridge, but not Mr. Ryan.

The Rev. William Case, the other Canadian presiding elder, had also been "left at home" at this time; but he, considering that his brethren had a perfect right to make their own selection, in contrast with Mr. Ryan, readily acquiesced in their decision. Mr. Ryan having returned to Canada in a state of vexation with his American brethren, resolved to be free from their control. He accordingly fomented the agitation which finally resulted in the separation of the Church in

this country from the parent body; and subsequently in his own withdrawal from the connection, and organizing a new sect. To such lengths does self-will lead men. Artfully covering his ambition by a cloak of loyalty, and urging the same arguments as those used by the English missionaries, that is, that the societies in Canada should not be under any foreign superintendence, he spread dissatisfaction throughout his large district. The upper district, presided over by Mr. Case, was measurably free from agitation. But our limits oblige us to postpone the conclusion of our history to another article.

## ART. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

### PROTESTANTISM.

#### THE PROTESTANT WORLD.

STATISTICS OF PROTESTANTISM—PROTESTANT AND ROMAN CATHOLIC COUNTRIES—COMPARATIVE GROWTH OF PROTESTANTISM AND ROMAN CATHOLICISM.—A glance at the current statements concerning the present number of Protestants reveals the widest discrepancy. Thus the new volume of the *Christian Year-Book*, published in England, contains the following statements: "Taking the population (of the world) to be 1288 millions, they have been divided according to religious denominations, thus: Protestants, 76,000,000; Romish Church, 170,000,000; Greek Orthodox Church, 89,000,000; Jews, 5,000,000; Mohammedans, 160,000,000; Buddhists, 340,000,000; other Asiatic Religions, 260,000,000; Heathen, or Pagans, 200,000,000. Another classification is: Catholics, 185,000,000; Protestants, 106,000,000," etc. The *Year-Book* next gives a list of religious denominations from Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*, and summarizes it as follows: "Protestants of various orders, 68,630,000; other religionists, including Universalists, Mormons, Tunkers, Swedenborgians, and Shakers, 693,000." Here are three different statements, estimating the number of Protestants severally at 68,000,000, 76,000,000, and 106,000,000. It is clear that statements so widely divergent are entirely worthless.

Still the subject is one in which every

Protestant feels an interest. The comparison of Protestant and Roman Catholic countries, of Protestant and Roman Catholic civilization, of the relative growth of Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, presupposes some knowledge of the relative strength of these two large divisions of the Christian world. In the following lines we shall endeavor to show what is, according to our present statistical knowledge of the religious denominations of the world, the most probable estimate of the present numerical strength of Protestantism.

To arrive at a proper understanding of statistical statements of this kind, it is, however, necessary to premise two explanations, one relative to the use of the name Protestant, and another relative to the idea of denominational statistics of population.

The name Protestant, which originated in 1529, at the Diet of Spires, and properly referred only to the protest of the German princes who favored the new Reformation against some resolutions passed by the majority of the Diet, has gradually come to be the ordinary designation of all those Christians who are not either Roman Catholics or members of the Eastern Churches. There is a need for some common name of this class of Christians; because—whether right or wrong we do not decide—there are in the opinions of millions strong bonds of union, which characterize it as one division of the Christian Church, in opposition to the Roman

Catholics and the Eastern Churches. Other names have been proposed instead of Protestant, such as "Evangelical Catholic;" but new names of this class, however appropriate, rarely succeed in supplanting those already in common use, and as regards "Evangelical Catholic," in particular, it appears to be less proper for a name which is intended to embrace all Rationalists. It is an important objection to the use of the name Protestant, that an influential party in one of the large Christian denominations, the Anglican Church, refuse to be classified with Protestants, and would prefer a classification with the Episcopal Eastern Churches; but as long as no other more appropriate name has been agreed upon, the statistician has a right to adhere to names in common use, after having duly noticed that many Anglican, some Baptists, and perhaps some portions of other denominations, protest against being counted in. In the case of the Anglicans this may be done all the sooner, as one of the main branches of the Anglican Church, the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, retains the word Protestant in the official title of the Church.

As regards, secondly, the religious statistics of the population of the several countries, it is essential well to distinguish between statistics of members of a religious denomination and religious statistics of population. Full statistical accuracy can only be obtained as regards membership, and it is gratifying to know that the religious denominations both in America and in Europe begin to pay a greater attention to this subject. Religious statistics of the population can obviously only consist of estimates. It means the population which lives and grows up under the formative influence of a particular religious doctrine. Formerly almost every government of Europe required all its subjects to be connected with some particular religious denomination, and the official census contained ecclesiastical as well as political statistics; but as religion is being more generally recognized as a free act of every citizen which does not concern the state government, the holding of ecclesiastical censuses has already been discontinued in a number of countries. It is, however, clear from the results of the official ecclesiastical censuses, taken by state governments in countries where the profession

of any form of religious belief or unbelief is not amenable to secular laws, that the number of persons who report themselves as "Deists," "of no religion," or in any way as non-Christians, is exceedingly small, and it is, therefore, proper to class the immense majority of the population in the Christian countries of Europe and America, which is not reported as "Roman Catholic," or as "Jews," under the head of "Protestant." The following list contains the total population of every large country, revised according to the latest statistical manuals, (such as the *Gotha Almanac* for 1868, etc.,) and the estimates of the Protestant population:

## I. AMERICA.

1. UNDER AMERICAN GOVERNMENTS.	Total Population.	Protestants.
United States of America..	31,429,891	25,000,000
(With the late Russian America) .....	70,000	.....
Mexico .....	8,218,080	5,000
Central America .....	2,500,000	.....
United States of Colombia.	2,794,473	4,000
Venezuela .....	1,265,000	.....
Ecuador .....	1,040,371	.....
Peru .....	2,500,000	1,000
Bolivia .....	1,987,352	.....
Chili .....	2,084,945	10,000
Brazil .....	11,750,000	100,000
Argentine Republic .....	1,465,000	10,000
Paraguay .....	1,237,431	.....
Uruguay .....	240,965	8,000
Hayti and St. Domingo .....	900,000	10,000
2. UNDER EUROPEAN GOVERNMENTS.		
Dominion of Canada (including Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland) (1861) .....	3,295,706	1,750,000
Other British Possessions ..	1,140,000	600,000
French Possessions (1862) ..	306,912	.....
Spanish " .....	1,032,062	.....
Dutch " .....	86,702	35,000
Swedish " .....	18,000	.....
Danish " .....	48,111	55,000
Total .....	75,841,002	27,583,000

## II. EUROPE.

	Total Population.	Protestants.
Portugal .....	4,349,966	7,000
Spain .....	16,302,625	10,000
France .....	38,067,094	1,900,000
No. German Confederation.	29,248,583	20,682,000
South German States (including Lichtenstein) ..	8,524,460	3,351,000
Austria .....	22,572,002	3,237,000
Italy .....	24,550,815	60,000
Papal States .....	690,000	1,000
San Marino .....	7,600	.....
Switzerland .....	2,510,494	1,482,000
Holland .....	3,532,665	2,200,000
Luxemburg .....	203,831	.....
Belgium .....	4,384,451	25,000
Great Britain .....	29,591,000	23,000,000
Denmark .....	1,684,004	1,675,000
Sweden and Norway .....	5,862,135	5,800,000
Russia (including Poland and Finland) .....	68,224,892	4,122,000
Turkey .....	15,725,397	30,000
Greece .....	1,248,412	3,000
Total .....	288,061,165	67,285,500



## III. OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD.

	Total Population.	Protestants
Asia .....	798,635,000	723,000
Africa .....	188,000,000	739,000
Australasia .....	8,854,000	1,050,000

Thus, in a total population of about 1,355,000,000, the Protestant population may be set down at about 97,200,000. The Protestant population as yet does not constitute a majority in any of the large divisions of the world; but it will soon in Australasia, where paganism is fast disappearing, and where the Protestants constitute a majority in each of the incipient states. In America Protestantism prevails in the most powerful, most growing, and populous country, and if the rate of increase will be in future what it has been in the past, is sure to outgrow Roman Catholicism. Even in Europe, where the numerical preponderance of the Roman Catholic Church is most striking, there are hardly any two Roman Catholic nations to match the combined influence of Great Britain and the North German Confederation, the two leading Protestant states.

## GREAT BRITAIN.

A NEW PROJECT OF ECCLESIASTICAL UNION—THE ANGLICANS AND THE WESLEYANS.—We have reported from time to time in the *Methodist Quarterly Review* on the progress of the various movements for an ecclesiastical union of denominations heretofore separated. The most important of these movements are the movements, 1, for the union of the several Methodist bodies; 2, for a union of the several Presbyterian bodies; 3, for a union of the Established Church of England and Ireland with the Anglican Communion of Scotland, of the British Colonies, and of the United States of North America; 4, of the Anglican Church, in general, with the Oriental Churches, and chiefly with the Greek Churches. To these projects, which have for years been the subject of animated discussion, another has recently been added, namely, of a union between the Anglican Church and the Wesleyans. The idea is a novel one, and appears to have been started by an Anglican paper of High-Church tendencies, the *Guardian*, which publishes a number of letters from friends of the movement. Among these letters, one from the Rev. Peter G. Medd, M.A., who is a fellow and tutor of University Col-

lege, Oxford, seems to have attracted special attention. Mr. Medd thinks that in the face of the imminent struggle between Christianity on one hand and the aggressive powers of lawlessness and unbelief on the other, a reunion of all who hold the Nicene Creed is greatly desirable. As regards, in particular, a union between the Anglican Church and the Wesleyans, he makes some important concessions. The internal moral discipline of the Wesleyan Connection, he says, is superior to that of the Church of England, "if, indeed, the Church can be said to have any at all." In his opinion, the failure of the Church of England to welcome, adopt, and direct the Wesleyan movement, which was "essentially good and religious," was "the greatest evil that has befallen her for the last two centuries." He even makes the sweeping assertion that but for Wesleyanism the masses of the large town populations would not have been almost, but altogether practically heathen. Mr. Medd lays down his plan of a union as follows:

I am not the one to recommend the smallest departure from the essential principles of ecclesiastical order. Episcopal supervision must be secured, and the administration of the sacraments (except, of course, baptism in case of necessity) must be rigidly confined to persons in holy orders. This done, I would at once admit the whole of the Wesleyan system into connection with our own system almost as it stands. Such of their ministers as desired and were found fit (I believe that would be the majority) might, after due inquiry and examination, be ordained. They might then (with or without their system of itinerancy) continue to minister to the same congregations as before, in the same buildings (duly consecrated and licensed as chapels-of-ease to the parish church in whose parish they were locally situate) and with the same services as before, excepting only in the administration of the sacraments, when the Church's forms should be alone authorized. Their smaller meeting-houses, usually served by local preachers, might, in most cases, continue much as at present, of course under episcopal license and control, as useful supplements and feeders to the parish church.

While earnestly deprecating, as full of danger to the peace of our own body, in the present uneasy state of affairs, any alteration whatsoever of our existing services and Prayer book, I must say that,

after years of consideration, I can see no valid objection to, no real difficulty in, allowing to exist, side by side with them, a set of subsidiary services of a more elastic and popular and less formal kind, conducted by licensed lay readers or permanent deacons, (men of middle class, earning an honest livelihood by trade,) of whose piety and moral fitness the bishop should satisfy himself.

The interest taken by the Anglican Church in the question was shown by the fact that it formed a prominent subject of discussion at the meeting of the Convocation of York, which began on the 6th of February. One of the friends of the movement, Archdeacon Hamilton, made the following motion:

That whereas there now exists a very general desire for Christian unity, and the causes which led to the formation of the Wesleyan body as a distinct community are sensibly diminished, it is the opinion of this house that an attempt should be made to effect brotherly reconciliation between the Wesleyan body and the Church of England; and, therefore, with a view of promoting this most desirable object, a committee of this house be appointed to enter into communication with the president of the Wesleyan Conference, and to invite him to procure the nomination of an equal number of that body, to meet such committee for the purpose of considering the possibility of a thorough reunion between the Wesleyan community and the Church of England.

The motion was warmly supported by a number of members, and great praise bestowed upon the Wesleyans as a body of earnest Christians; still the majority were adverse to this motion, some urging against it as a reason only the probability that the Wesleyans would not entertain any such proposition for union; while others, among whom were the Bishops of Carlisle and Ripon, regarded Wesleyanism as "the largest and most fatal schism" which the Church has known for the last two centuries. Archdeacon Hamilton, finding that the majority of the Convocation was against the proposition, was prevailed upon to withdraw his motion, when the following amendment, offered by the Bishop of Ripon, was adopted:

That whereas the union of faithful Christians is earnestly to be desired, and many of the causes which originally led to the separation of the Wesleyans from the Church of England are sensibly diminished, this house would cordially

welcome any practical attempt to effect a brotherly reconciliation between the Wesleyan body and the Church of England.

Thus the project failed. It is noteworthy that, while in the case of all the other ecclesiastical movements the party proposing the union met the second party either as a peer, or even, as in the case of the union between the Anglicans and the Greeks, as superiors, the Anglicans in the above case treated the Wesleyans as their inferiors. They did not properly propose a union, but, to use their own expression, a "reabsorption." Such a proposition could, of course, not be entertained for a moment. The *London Watchman*, in showing the absurdity of the proposition, refers to an address made some twenty-five years ago by the conference to the Methodist societies regarding the Established Church.

The conference then officially and solemnly avowed that the title of "*The Church*," to be regarded as one of the main bulwarks of the Protestant faith had been grievously shaken; opinions being held by a large number of the clergy that the Scripture was insufficient as the sole and universal rule of faith and practice; that episcopal ordination had exclusive validity; that the sacraments possessed a necessarily saving efficacy; a revival of which sentiments was, in its consequences, directly leading to Popery. It was likewise stated that the simplicity of worship was depreciated in comparison with the gorgeous ritual of Rome, and that, amid all the zeal for externals, the vital and essential doctrine of justification by faith was awfully obscured or denied.

The *Watchman* then briefly refers to tenets held at present by the Romanizing and the Rationalistic parties in the Anglican Church as constituting much weightier arguments against any proposition of union.

The chief organ of the evangelical party in the Anglican Church, the *Record*, also declares that it has no faith in the practicability of a reunion of the Wesleyans with the Church of England. Thus the affair is regarded on all sides as being at an end.

THE COLENZO CASE—THE ACTION OF THE PAN-ANGELICAN SYNOD—EFFORTS FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF ANOTHER BISHOP OF NATAL—STRONG OPPOSITION OF THE BISHOP OF LONDON—AN IMPOR-

TANT JUDICIAL DECISION IN FAVOR OF COLENZO.—The Pan-Anglican Synod, of which we gave a full account in the last number of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, passed two resolutions on the Colenzo case, *one*, declaring the whole Anglican communion to be deeply injured by the present condition of the Church in Natal, and asking for the appointment of a committee to report on the best mode by which the Church might be delivered from the continuance of this great scandal, and the true faith maintained; and *another*, expressing acquiescence in a resolution, passed in June, 1866, by the Convocation of Canterbury, and giving some advice to the diocese in case the consecration of a new bishop should be decided upon. These resolutions were adopted almost unanimously, there being but three hands raised against it. The synod thus expressed its condemnation of the views held by Colenzo, and its desire for his removal. At an adjourned meeting of the Pan-Anglican Synod, which met on December 10, and at which forty-two bishops were present, the Committee of the Synod on the State of the Church in the diocese of Natal reported that the whole Anglican Communion was deeply grieved at the present condition of the Church, and recommended the general meeting to appoint a committee of prelates to report on the best mode by which the Church might be delivered from a continuance of scandal and the faith maintained. This was accordingly done.

In January the Bishop of Capetown, still sojourning in England, officially announced: "One has at length been elected to the office of Bishop of the Church in Natal. The appointment has been made by the Metropolitan and the Bishop of Grahamstown, in concurrence with the Archbishop of Canterbury." The person chosen was the Rev. W. R. Macrorie, M.A., Incumbent of St. James's, Acerrington. The 25th of January was appointed for the consecration of the new bishop. But before that day the Bishop of London, the most determined champion of the State-Church system among the English bishops, and as such opposed to any Church measures for the removal of Colenzo, published a letter, which he had addressed to the Bishop of Capetown, endeavoring urgently to dissuade him from doing what would involve a violation of the law. If the consecration be performed in England, the English Consecration Service can alone be law-

fully used under the Act of Uniformity. That service prescribes the production of the Royal Mandate, and the Bishop of London says:

Moreover, the bishop elect is called upon to declare in the face of the congregation that he is persuaded he is truly called to his ministration in the office of a bishop, not only according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, but also "according to the order of this realm." To many it seems inconceivable that any man will be found to make this solemn declaration, in the midst of all these doubts, before the legality of his consecration has been publicly established by some competent authority. It is in very mild but decided terms that the Bishop of London reminds Dr. Gray that he is "taking a leap in the dark."

He adds:

Meanwhile your brother bishops in England may well be thrown into great perplexity. We know not in which of our dioceses an act which, to say the least, is of most doubtful legality, is to take place. We may read in the newspapers any morning that the thing has been already done, and we may be left in the disagreeable position of being called upon by others, as well as moved by our sense of public duty, to visit some of our clergy for taking part in proceedings contrary to the law of the Church and realm; when, had we been properly informed beforehand, and the matter formally investigated, we might have prevented them from committing themselves.

This letter was followed by another to the same effect, from the Archbishop of York. These letters had considerable effect. The original idea of having Mr. Macrorie consecrated in England was abandoned, and an attempt made to have him consecrated at Perth, in Scotland. To prevent this the Bishop of London addressed a letter to the Primus of the Scottish Church. The following is the most important portion of this letter:

Feeling a deep interest in the Scottish Episcopal Church, and knowing well the ecclesiastical condition of Scotland, I cannot but be very anxious that no steps should be taken likely to create divisions in that Church, or to represent it as in any way separating itself from the Established Church of England, or putting itself in opposition to English law. You say, in your letter of January 25, that his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury informs you that "he sees no objection to the consecration taking place in Scotland in accordance with the

request of the South African bishops." His Grace, in so expressing himself, no doubt naturally looks not so much to the interest of the Scottish Episcopal Church, with which he must necessarily be but imperfectly acquainted, as to his individual view of Bishop Colenso's deposition. Might I suggest also that his Grace has made no public declaration that his opinion differs materially in this matter from that of the Archbishop of York and myself, and that such a private expression of opinion as you allude to is something very different from a formal and public request that you would facilitate the proposed consecration? If I might venture to suggest to the bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church, I would say that they ought not to presume his Grace's concurrence and sanction without some formal approval and request. Without this it seems to me unfair to his Grace to take so serious a step, and in any way to make it rest on his Grace's single private authority, unsupported by any public document expressing his official decision, or the decision of any meeting of his suffragans in convocation or elsewhere.

When the consecration was about to take place, a telegram from the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, during the whole progress of this Colenso controversy, has shown the greatest vacillation, prevented any further step being taken in the matter. Soon after the Bishop of Capetown left England for his diocese, without having achieved his purpose, the consecration of a new bishop.

In the mean time an important judicial decision had been rendered in the colony of Natal in favor of Colenso. The Supreme Court of the colony decided that Natal was a crown colony when the plaintiff's patent was issued; that Dr. Colenso, therefore, is trustee of all the buildings, and has ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The judgment further ejects Dean Green from the deanery, and prohibits him from officiating in any of Dr. Colenso's churches. At a meeting held by the opponents of Dr. Colenso, it was resolved not to appeal against this judgment, but to erect or hire temporary churches, and that Dean Green should at once proceed to England.

#### THE EASTERN CHURCHES.

STATISTICS OF THE GREEK AND THE OTHER EASTERN CHURCHES.—THE EFFORTS TO ESTABLISH INTERCOMMUNION WITH THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.—The statistics of the Greek and other Eastern Communions at the close of the year

1867 were (so far as they can be ascertained) as follows:

1. *The Greek Church*.—Russia, (in Europe, 51,000,000; in Siberia, 2,600,000; in the provinces of the Caucasus no official account of the ecclesiastical statistics has yet been made; the total population of this part of the empire is 4,257,000, the population connected with the Greek Church may be estimated at about 1,500,000; hence, total population of Russia connected with the Greek Church is about) 55,000,000; Turkey, (inclusive of the dependencies in Europe and Egypt,) about 11,500,000; Austria, 2,921,000; Greece, (inclusive of Ionian Islands,) 1,220,000; United States of America, (chiefly in the territory purchased in 1867 from Russia,) 50,000; Prussia, 1,500; China, 200: total, 69,692,700.

Of the figures above given, those referring to Russia, Austria, and Prussia are from an official census; those concerning China are furnished by the Russian missionaries in Peking; those on Turkey and Greece are estimates almost generally adopted. It is, therefore, evident that the total given has a high claim to approximative correctness.

2. *The Armenian Church*.—According to one of the best authorities on the subject of the Eastern Churches, Dr. Petermann, (in his article in Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*,) the total number of Armenians scattered in the world is about 2,500,000. Of these about 100,000 are connected with Rome, and are called United Armenians; 15,000 are Evangelical Armenians, and all others belong to the National (or "Gregorian") Armenian Church. The number of the latter may, therefore, be set down at about 2,400,000. The great majority of them (about 2,000,000) live in Turkey, about 170,000 in Russia, and 30,000 in Persia.

3. *The Nestorians*, including the *Christians of St. Thomas* in India, number, according to the most trustworthy accounts, about 165,000 souls, exclusive of those who have connected themselves with Rome, or have become Protestants.

4. *The Jacobites* in Turkey and India are estimated at about 220,000, but the information concerning them is less trustworthy and definite than that about the preceding Churches.

5. *The Copts and Abyssinians*.—The Copts may be roughly estimated at about 200,000, the Abyssinians at 3,000,000.

Together, therefore, the population connected with these Eastern Communion embraces a population of about 76,500,000.

All these bodies lay claim to having bishops of apostolical succession, and consequently all of them are embraced in the union scheme patronized by the High-Church Anglicans. Both the Low-Church and the Broad-Church parties dislike the idea of a union with the Greeks, Copts, Abyssinians, and the other Eastern Communions; but the High-Churchmen, of all shades of opinion, are a unit on this subject, and the action favorable to the union movement which has been taken by both the English Convocations and the General Convention of the United States shows the great ascendancy of High-Church tendencies in the Anglican Communion. An important fact in the history of this movement is the official transmission of a Greek translation of the pastoral letter issued by the Pan-Anglican Synod to all the patriarchs and bishops of the Greek Church, accompanied by the following letter:

*In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. To the patriarchs, metropolitans, archbishops, bishops, priests and deacons, and other beloved brethren of the Eastern Orthodox Church, Charles Thomas, by Divine Providence Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Metropolitan, sends greeting in the Lord:*

"If one member suffer," the holy apostle says, "all the members suffer with it; if one member is honored, all the members rejoice with it." Wherefore we, having called to a conference our brethren the bishops of that part of the Catholic Church which is in communion with us, and which by God's grace is spreading itself forth in all regions of the earth, and having come together with them for the sake of united prayer and deliberation, and having written with all readiness of mind and brotherly love an encyclical epistle to the priests and deacons and laity of our communion, notify to you, as brethren in the Lord, what has lately taken place among us, in order that ye also may rejoice with us in our oneness of mind. Furthermore, we send to you a copy of the said epistle, in order that when ye read it, ye may see what is the mind of the Anglican Church concerning the faith of Christ, and that ye may know that we acknowledge, and, God willing, are resolved to maintain, firmly and immovably, all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the sure word of God; and to contend earnestly

for the faith once for all delivered to the saints, and to hold fast the creeds of the one holy and apostolic Church, and to keep pure and undefiled the primitive order and worship as we have received it from our Lord Jesus Christ and from his holy apostles, and that with one mind and one voice we reject and put far away from us all innovations and corruptions contrary to the Gospel of Christ, very God and very man, and that we earnestly desire to fulfill the preaching of his saving truth to all nations of the earth, in order that the kingdoms of the world may become the kingdoms of the Lord and his Christ. May the Lord grant unto all to have the same mind in all things, that there may be "one flock and one Shepherd!"

The English papers which are friendly to the movement state that this letter was received with profound respect and unfeigned admiration by several prelates of the Russian Church. They also state that "the reunion-school at Moscow, well represented both at the university and at the theological seminary, is full of hope as regards the preparation of a common basis for peace negotiations." At the second annual meeting of the "Eastern Church Society" of England, held in 1867, Rev. Mr. Williams, one of the most zealous champions of the intercommunion movement, stated that he had conversed with the Greek patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and with other eminent Eastern bishops on the subject, and that all had expressed their entire approbation of the union of the Churches. Mr. Williams declared, moreover, that the Metropolitan of Scio had said to him that the time for electing commissioners from both sides to adjust the differences between them was at hand; and that the Patriarch of Antioch had assured him that he proposes to found a school as a preparation for the union, and he desired to obtain an Englishman as a professor in it, that the members of it might learn the English language.

A singular document, with regard to the effort to establish close relations between the Anglican and Eastern communions, is an address from Nestorian bishops, presbyters, deacons, and laymen to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, purporting to express the sentiments of the Nestorian Church. The Nestorians, says the address, are suffering persecution from both Mohammedans and Papists, and among themselves there is the most



abject spiritual ignorance. "In fact, we are told the clergy are on a par as regards spiritual matters, all apparently walking in the road to perdition." An appeal is therefore made to the Church of England, as being endowed with "riches and knowledge," to send spiritual laborers to the Nestorians. It is hardly credible that such a document should receive the names of the three

bishops and three presbyters whose names are signed to it. We know, however, from the reports of the American missionaries among the Nestorians, that efforts have of late been made by High-Church Anglicans to prejudice the Nestorians among the missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners of Foreign Missions, and draw them into union with the Church of England.

## ART. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

### GERMANY.

One of the best German writers on Palestine, Titus Tobler, has compiled a *Geographical Bibliography of Palestine*, (*Bibliographia Geographica Palestinae*, Leipzig, 1867,) a work of immense labor, for every one acquainted at all with geographical literature knows the works on Palestine to be exceedingly numerous. Attempts at compiling a bibliography of this kind had previously been made by Rosenmüller, (in Vol. I of his *Handbuch der bibl. Alterthumskunde*, 1823,) by Dr. Robinson, (Vol. I of his *Palestine*, 1841,) and by Dr. Carl Ritter, (*Erdkunde*. Part V. 1850.) But all these lists were incomplete, and, besides, needed continuation. Tobler is specially qualified for a work of this kind by his habitual thoroughness and accuracy. His book consists of three parts: the first (pp. 5-206) catalogues, and briefly characterizes, "works which certainly, or most probably, were written by eye-witnesses," from the *Pilgrim of Bordeaux*, in A.D. 333, to the year 1865; the second (pp. 207-226) works by writers "who certainly, or most probably, did not know Palestine from personal inspection," the first being probably St. Eucherius of Lyons, about 445; the third (pp. 227-248) contains maps, and an alphabetical index of sixteen pages closes the book. A large number of works, especially Greek and Slavic, are here registered for the first time. Among the latest German additions to the Palestine literature is a new work by Prof. Sepp, [Roman Catholic,] author of a *Life of Jesus* in 7 vols., a work on *Jerusalem and the Holy Land* in 2 vols., etc. The Protestant papers recognize the great scholarship of the author, and

accept as correct some of the new views he presents; but show him to be frequently rash in his conjectures and untrustworthy in his grammatical illustrations, (*Neue architektonische Studien und histor.-topogr. Forschungen in Palestina*. Warzburg, 1867.) Prof. Sepp was formerly Professor of History at the University of Munich, but was recently [January, 1868] dismissed by the government of Bavaria.

The forerunners of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century are not yet so fully known as they deserve to be, for to Protestants these—frequently secret—reformatory movements in the Middle Ages are one of the most interesting portions of Church history. A little work by Dr. Pröhle makes us acquainted with an Augustine monk of the second half of the fifteenth century, Andreas Proles, whom Luther highly esteemed, and counted among the most enlightened witnesses of the Gospel. [*Andreas Proles*, etc. Gotha, 1867.] The above is the first work on Proles, and is highly commended for its careful compilation. In addition to its information on Proles, it contains an interesting account of the evangelical tendency in the Augustinian order in Germany.

The Roman Catholic Church of Germany produces at present a larger number of able theological works than all the other countries of the world together; but at Rome they are anything but satisfied with this literature, as among the prominent theologians there are few who are regarded in Rome as perfectly sound in the faith. It sometimes happens that the greatest zealots for the interests of the Roman Catholic Church advocate views which every one knows



to be abhorred at Rome. Thus a considerable sensation has recently been created by a little book [*Fünfzig Thesen*, etc., Braunsberg, 1867] on the ecclesiastical situation of the present age, by Professor Fr. Michelis of Braunsberg, editor of the periodical *Natur und Offenbarung*, member of the German Parliament in 1867, etc. Michelis advocates the full and mutual independence of Church and State, and the obligatory introduction of civil marriage, denies the superiority of the Church over the State, the idea of a "Christian" [theocratic] state, all tenets for which the popes ever since Gregory VII. have not ceased to raise their voice. It censures some acts of the German bishops, and even praises the letter of the Emperor of Austria, which indicates the abolition of the Concordat. The whole Roman Catholic press of Germany is discussing the question whether the book is anti-Catholic or not. Among the literary papers there is an evident sympathy with the liberal author, while the popular sheets, which are under the more direct influence of the bishops, and bear more the character of party organs, denounce the book, and predict its condemnation by the pope.

Of the work of Professor Hergenröther on Photius, whose appearance has already been announced by us, the second volume has been issued, continuing the work to the death of Photius. The author has been called to Rome by the Pope to assist in the preparations which are being made for the convocation of the Ecumenical Council.

Of the great work of Professor W. Gass on the *History of the Protestant Dogmatics*, [*Geschichte der prot. Dogmatik*, etc. Berlin, 1867,] the fourth volume has appeared. It embraces the age of Rationalism, the theological views of the several philosophical schools, and the age of Schleiermacher.

Of new editions we notice Guericke's *Introduction into the New Testament*, [N. T. *liche Isagogik*, 3d ed., Leipzig, 1867,] De Wette's *Commentary to the Epistles to Titus, Timotheus, and the Hebrews*, [*Handbuch zum N. T.*, 2d vol., 5th part, 3d edit., Leipzig, 1867.]

Among recent announcements of new German books we find several posthumous writings of prominent theologians. The *Lectures* by the late Professor Bleek,

of Bonn, on the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, edited by Windrath, (*Der Hebräerbrief*, Elberfeld, 1868,) is an epitome of the well-known larger *Commentary to the Epistle of the Hebrews*, by Dr. Bleek, which appeared in 1840, and is at the same time to serve as a thoroughly revised edition of the larger work. Of the *Lectures on Church History* of the late Dr. J. A. Möhler, the greatest Roman Catholic theologian of Germany of the nineteenth century, the first two volumes have recently been published by P. B. Gams, (*Kirchengeschichte*, Ratisbon, 1868,) and the third volume, which completes the work, is to appear in the course of the year.

A new Bible Lexicon has just been commenced under the editorship of Professor Dr. Schenkel, of Heidelberg. (*Bibel-Lexicon*, Leipzig, 1868.) Among the contributors are mentioned Dr. Bruch, professor at Strassburg, one of the editors of the first complete collection of the works of John Calvin, which is now in course of publication; Dr. Diestel, Professor at Greifswald; Dr. Dillmann, who is supposed to have among living scholars the most thorough knowledge of Ethiopian language and literature; Dr. Gass, author of the great work on the *History of Dogmatic Theology*; Lie. Hausrath, author of a work on the *Apostle Paul*; Dr. Hitzig, professor in Heidelberg, well known by his commentary on the *Psalms* and other books of the *Old Testament*; Dr. Holtzmann, professor in Heidelberg, author of several works on the *history of the New Testament* and on the early period of the *Christian Church*; Dr. Keim, professor in Zürich, author of several works on *Life of Jesus*; Dr. Lipsius, professor in Kiel, and favorably known in the theological world by keen investigations on the *history of the Gnostics* and other historical and exegetical writings; Dr. Merx, the editor of the new periodical, which is exclusively devoted to the *Old Testament*; Dr. Reuss, of Strassburg, author of a celebrated *Introduction to the Books of the New Testament*, and numerous other works; Dr. C. Schwarz, of Gotha, author of a popular work on the recent literature of Protestant theology; Dr. Schweitzer, of Zürich, author of the work on the *Central-Dogmen* of the Reformed Church. Most of these contributors are known as moderate liberals, (Rationalists,) and the new work is un-

doubtedly intended to be a manifesto of the party. At the same time the names of the contributors above mentioned are a guarantee that the new lexicon will contain many articles of great scholarship and value. The work is to consist of four volumes. Of the prominent men of the non-negative Tübingen school none are mentioned as contributors.

Simultaneously with the above Bible Lexicon, a new Theological Cyclopaedia, (*Theologisches Universal-Lexicon*, Elberfeld, 1868,) has been begun, which is to embrace in two volumes a brief compendium of all the matter generally contained in theological cyclopedias. The names of the editors and contributors are not mentioned. The prospectus promises an entirely objective treatment of all subjects. It is to be finished in about two years.

A new addition to the copious recent literature on the theology of Luther, and of the early Lutheran Church, has been made by a work of Dr. H. Schmid, Professor of Theology at the University of Erlangen, entitled the *Struggle of the Lutheran Church on Luther's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper during the Age of Reformation*, (*Kampf der luth. Kirche um Luther's Lehre vom Abendmahl*, Leipsic, 1863.) The Church Constitution aimed at by the Lutheran Reformation is the subject of a little work by Professor von Zesschwitz, well known for his large work on Catechetics, (*Ueber die wesentlichen Verfassungsziele der luth. Reformation*, Leipsic, 1867.) On the downfall of the Crypto-Calvinists in Saxony, in 1574, one of the darkest periods in the early history of Lutheranism, a thorough article has been written by Dr. Kluckhohn, who is regarded as one of the ablest writers on this period of Church history. (*Sturz der Krypto-Calvinisten*, in Sybel's *Historische Zeitschrift*, vol. xviii.)

#### ITALY.

The first volume of the Gospel printed at the Propaganda office from the ancient Greek manuscript in the Vatican Library, under the direction of Chevalier Pietro Marietti, has appeared. It has been revised by Fathers Vercellone and Cozza. This Vatican Codex was written very accurately, apparently in the fourth century, and all friends of sacred erudition were desirous of an edition of it which would represent the same quality and form of letter, and the precise num-

ber of letters and lines. The first volume contains the Gospel according to St. Matthew. The entire publication will extend to six volumes, the last containing notes and dissertations.

#### FRANCE.

In France a great activity has for several years been displayed in the publication of new editions of some of the largest works of Roman Catholic literature. Quite a number of these are at present going through the press. Of the new edition of the *Acta Sanctorum*, edited by Carnandet, twenty-seven volumes had been published up to the end of the year 1867. As the reproduction embraces the fifty-four first volumes of the collection, and as about ten volumes are published annually, this new edition will be completed in the year 1870. It will cost about eight hundred dollars. The first two volumes of this work appeared in the year 1643, the fifty-third volume ending at the 15th of October, and being the sixth volume of the Saints of October, in 1794. The invasion of Belgium by the French scattered the library of the Bollandists, and thus interrupted the continuation of the work. In 1847, a society of Jesuits, supported by the Belgian government, resumed the work; and the fifth-fourth volume appeared in 1846; the fifty-fifth in 1854; the fifty-sixth in 1858; the fifty-seventh in 1861; and the fifty-eighth in 1865.

A new edition of the Annals of Baronius, with the continuations by A. Theiner, is published at Bar-le-Duc. It is to embrace about 45 volumes. Thus far 11 volumes have been published, reaching to the year 679. (*Annales Ecclesiastici*.)

Of the translation of the complete works of Chrysostom by Abbé J. Barreille, volume ix has been published. The whole will embrace twenty-six volumes and cost 400 francs. (*Oeuvres complètes*, Besançon.)

An important work on the relations of the Church of Rome and the first empire has been published by Count Haussenville. It contains many documents which had not been published before. (*L'église Romaine*, etc. Paris, 1867.)

The work on St. Apollinaris and his Age, by Abbé Chaix, has been completed by the publication of the second volume.

(*St. Apollinaire et son Siècle*. Clermond, 1868.)

A compendious "Universal Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Science," in two volumes, has been published by Abbé Glaire, well known by a number of exegetical works. (*Dictionnaire Universel des Sciences Ecclésiastiques*. Tours, 1867.)

J. Chantrel, one of the editors of the *Univers*, has written a history of the Church of Rome from 1860 to 1866, intended as a continuation of the Church history of Rohrbacher. (*Annales Ecclésiastiques de 1860 à 1866*. Corbeil, 1867.)

"The Maid of Orleans," is the subject of another new work by Abbé Taughey. (*Etude sur Jeanne d'Arc*. Chaumont, 1867.)

A highly interesting pamphlet on "The Destruction of Protestantism in Bohemia," has been written by Professor R. Reuss. (*La Destruction du Protestantisme en Bohême*. Strassburg, 1867. It had originally appeared in the *Revue de Théologie*.) The author traces the Church history of Bohemia under Emperor Ferdinand II., from 1621 to 1628, and shows that the destruction of Protestantism was chiefly the work of the Papal nuncio Caraffa, who with cruel energy, and not without success, undertook to crush out Protestantism in all classes of the population. Among the chief sources from which the author derives his information are the memoirs of Caraffa himself.

#### ART. X.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

##### *American Quarterly Reviews.*

AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, January, 1868. (New York.)—1. Moral Philosophy in Great Britain. 2. The Activity of the Thinking Mind. 3. Presbyterian Reunion in the Colonies of Great Britain. 4. Presbyterian Division and Reunion. 5. Celebrated Preachers in the French Church. 6. The Philadelphia Presbyterian Union Convention.

BAPTIST QUARTERLY, January, 1868. (Philadelphia.)—1. Plutarch on the Delay of the Deity to punish the Wicked. 2. The Educational Problem in this Country. 3. Shedd's History of Christian Doctrine. 4. Celsus' Attack upon Christianity. 5. Francis Wayland. 6. Curtis on Inspiration.

BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, January, 1868. (Philadelphia.)—1. The English Language. 2. Prisons and Reformatories. 3. Presbyterian Reunion. 4. The Pastorate for the Times. 5. Liberal Christianity.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA, January, 1868. (Andover.)—1. The Natural Theology of Social Science. 2. Remarks on Second Epistle to the Corinthians iv, 3, 4. 3. The Nature of Sin. 4. The Claims of Theology. 5. The Egyptian Doctrine of a Future State. 6. The Site of Sodom. 7. The Present Attitude of Evangelical Christianity toward the Prominent Forms of Assault.

CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY, October, 1867. (Boston.)—1. David Thurston, with Portrait. 2. The Silence of Women in the Churches. 3. History of the Association of Ministers of Cumberland County, Me., from 1788 to 1867. 4. Gathering a Church and its Privileges. 5. Congregationalists Undenominational. 6. The First Christian Worship in New England. 7. A Blacksmith in the Pulpit and in the Parish. 8. Plagiarism. 9. An Aged Father's Hint. 10. Congregational Necrology.

CONGREGATIONAL REVIEW, January, 1868. (Boston.)—1. Christ's Death Supernatural. 2. Woman's Place in Religious Meetings. 3. The Apostle Paul the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. 4. The Object of Punishment in the Government of God. 5. Infant Baptism: When and Where should the Ordinance be Administered? 6. The State of the Country. 7. Short Sermons.

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XX.—19

EVANGELICAL QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1868. (Gettysburg.)—1. Life and Labors of Augustine. 2. Schmid's Dogmatic Theology. 3. The Human Element in Religion. 4. Bibliography. 5. The Image of God. 6. The Strength and Beauty of God's Sanctuary. 7. Reminiscences of Deceased Lutheran Ministers. 8. The Work of the Ministry. 9. Ministerial Success. 10. Geology and Moses. 11. The Reformation.

FREEWILL BAPTIST QUARTERLY, January, 1868. (Dover, N. H.)—1. Jesus Christ: His Person and His Plan. 2. Recreation and Amusements. 3. The Anti-slavery Record of the Freewill Baptists. 4. Christian Growth. 5. Murphy's Commentary. 6. The Perversion of the Gospel a Proof of its Divinity. 7. The German Philosophy.

MERCERSBURG REVIEW, January, 1868. (Philadelphia.)—1. The Sacramental System of the Early Church. 2. The Church Doctrine of the Forgiveness of Sin. 3. Force of Religious Ideas. 4. The Second Adam and the New Birth. 5. Presbyterian Union Convention. 6. Christian Nurture. 7. Forms of Prayer. 8. Authority and Freedom meeting in Faith.

NEW ENGLANDER, January, 1868. (New Haven.)—1. American and European Systems of Deaf-Mute Instruction Compared. 2. Divorce. Part IV.—Divorce and Divorce Law in Europe since the Reformation. 3. The National Debt. 4. A Review of the Memoir of President Wayland. 5. The Conference System. 6. Some Curious Coincidences respecting Slavery. 7. "What sort of Schools ought the State to keep?" 8. Meteoric Astronomy, and the New Haven Contributions to its Progress. 9. A Review of the two last volumes of the "Schönberg-Cotta" Series: "The Draytons and Davenants" and "On both Sides of the Sea." 10. The Jarves Collection of the Yale School of the Fine Arts.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, January, 1868. (Boston.)—1. Boston. 2. Francesco Dall' Ongaro's Stornelli. 3. Railroad Management. 4. The Character of Jonathan Swift. 5. Fraser's Report on the Common-school System. 6. Co-operation. 7. Witchcraft. 8. Nominating Conventions. 9. Governor Andrew.

UNIVERSALIST QUARTERLY, January, 1868. (Boston.)—1. Sources of Error in the Use of Language. 2. John Murray. 3. Right Ideas and their Test. 4. Errors of Lexicons of the New Testament. 5. Rationalism *versus* Miracles. 6. The Crusades. 7. Notices of Recent German Works.

---

### *English Reviews.*

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, January, 1868. (London.)—1. "The Catholic Revival:" its latest Aspect. 2. The Eastern Question: its Religious Bearings. 3. A Mohammedan Commentary on the Bible. 4. Scottish Christianity and Mr. Buckle. 5. Tyndale and the English Bible. 6. Rationalism not allied to Protestantism. 7. Lives of Celebrated Jewish Rabbis. 8. German History of the Reformation. 9. Page's "Man: Where, Whence, and Whither?"

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCE, January, 1868. (London.)—1. Montalembert's "Monks of the West." 2. The Neo-Classical Drama. 3. Our Merchant Princes. 4. Foreign State Education. 5. Early English Religious Writings. 6. Liddon's Bampton Lectures. 7. Recent Hymn Writers. 8. Education of Pauper Children. 9. Jane Taylor. 10. More Essays: the Position of Affairs.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, January, 1868. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Gachard's "Don Carlos, and Philip II." 2. Oysters, and the Oyster Fisheries. 3. Anjou. 4. Tyndall's Lectures on Sound. 5. Liberal Education in England. 6. Memoirs of Sir Philip Francis. 7. De Fezensac's Recollections of the Grand Army. 8. Two per Cent. 9. The Queen's Highland Journal.

LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1868. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Sir Walter Scott. 2. The Queen in the Islands and Highlands. 3. Private Confession in the Church of England. 4. Guizot's Memoirs. 5. The British Mu-

seum. 6. Longevity and Centenarianism. 7. Phœnicia and Greece. 8. Church Progress. 9. What shall we do for Ireland?

NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, December, 1867. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Relations of Heathenism and Judaism with Christianity. 2. Modern Provençal Poems. 3. Ralph Waldo Emerson. 4. The Natural History of Morals. 5. The Military Systems of Europe. 6. Population. 7. Italy in 1867. 8. The Social Sores of Britain.

WESTMINSTER REVIEW, January, 1868. (New York: Reprint.)—1. Dangers of Democracy. 2. Physiological Psychology. 3. Two Temporal Powers. 4. The Church in Scotland. 5. Extradition. 6. The Origin of Electricity. 7. Indian Worthies. 8. The Abyssinian Difficulty. 9. The Land Tenures of British India.

---

### German Reviews.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DIE HISTORISCHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Historic Theology.) 1868. Second Number.—3. NIPPOLD, Contributions to the Church History of Holland. 4. HERZOG, The Family Calas, and Voltaire, the Restorer of their Honor. 6. KLEMMER, The Significance of John Tenuhardt.

This periodical has greatly gained in point of interest since it has passed under the editorial management of Professor Kahnis, of Leipsic. The above number contains two very valuable articles by Professor Nippold, of Heidelberg, and Professor Herzog, of Eilangen. Professor Nippold reviews three new works on the Church History of Holland, and gives us on this occasion biographical sketches of their authors, all of whom belong among the most prominent theological scholars of Holland. The first of these works is a *Church History of the Netherlands before the Reformation*. (*Kerkgeschiedeniss van Nederland voor de Hervorming*, 1st vol., Arnheim, 1864.) Moll, professor at the Athenæum of Amsterdam, (a theological seminary of the Established Church of Holland,) is favorably known by several other historical works, (a *History of the Religious Life of the Christians during the first Six Centuries*, 2 vols., 1844, etc.,) and is called by Nippold the master of all Dutch Church historians. In consequence of the close relation existing between the Netherlands and the neighboring provinces of Germany, his book is of great interest also for the Church history of Germany, and continental Europe in general. The second volume, containing the Church history of Holland during the eleventh century, is in press. The second of the works, reviewed by Nippold, is one on *The Beginning and the Doctrine of the Earlier Baptists compared with those of the other Protestants*, by S. Hoekstra, professor at the Mennonite Seminary of Holland. (*Beginnselen en Leer der oude Doopgezinden, vergeleken met die van de overige Protestanten*, Amsterdam, 1863.) It discusses the origin of the Baptist denomination, and the relation of the Anabaptists to the

Mennonites and other Baptist communities; the common ground of all the divisions of the Church which in the sixteenth century separated from the Church of Rome; and the differences between the Lutheran, Reformed, and the Baptist parties. The third of the works reviewed by Professor Nippold is one by Christian Sepp, Mennonite preacher at Leyden, and editor of one of the leading Theological periodicals of Holland, (the *Theological Contributions*.) author of a *Pragmatic History of Theology in Holland from 1787 to 1858*, *Doctrine of the New Testament on the Writings of the Old Testament*, etc. It is entitled *John Stinstra and his Times*, (*Johannes Stinstra en zyn tyd*, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1865, 1866,) and gives a vivid description of the theological and ecclesiastical condition of Holland during the eighteenth century.

Professor Herzog, the editor of the *Real-Encyclopädie*, gives in the fourth article an interesting review of the celebrated trial of the Protestant family Calas, chiefly according to the work of Coquerel.

---

#### French Reviews.

REVUE CHRETIENNE, (Christian Review,) December, 1867.—1. Lichtenberger, Ecclesiastical Situation in Germany. 2. FROSSARD, Béranger. 3. DE SEYNES, Faraday.

January, 1868.—1. DE PRESSENSE, The Roman Question under the First Empire according to New Documents. 2. E. DE BONNECHOSE, Theodore Parker and the Present Crisis in the Reformed Church of France. 3. FROSSARD, Béranger.

February, 1868.—1. E. DE PRESSENSE, The Roman Question under the First Empire according to New Documents. 2. SABATIER, The Spiritualist School and the Religious Question. 3. ROSSEUW ST. HILAIRE, Legends of Alsatia.

This review fully sustains the high reputation which it has long occupied in the Protestant world. The list of articles given above shows the tact of the editors in selecting subjects, and all the articles which we have examined are ably treated. In addition to the articles every number also contains a review of recent literature, and a review of important ecclesiastical and political events. The *Review* is now in its fifteenth year.

The January number announces a list of articles to be published in the course of the year 1868, among which are the following: Guizot, on *Religious Philosophy*; Professor Pédézet on *Religious Orders and Christianity*; Secrétan, on *Victor Cousin*; Forgues, on *the Crisis in the United States*; Count Pelet de la Lozère, *Napoleon I. and Cromwell*.

BULLETIN THEOLOGIQUE, (Theological Bulletin,) January, 1868.—1. LE SAVOUREUX, *History of the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament*. 2. ARNAUD, The Teaching of Jesus Christ on the Holy Spirit. 3. CORBIERE, Luthardt's Salutory Truths of Christianity. 4. WABNITZ, Bulletin of German Literature. 5. HOLLARD, Richard Rothe.



## ART. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

*Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.*

*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Genesis.* With a new Translation, by J. G. MURPHY, D.D., T.C.D., Professor of Hebrew, Belfast. With a Preface, by J. P. THOMPSON, D.D., New York City. 8vo., pp. 519. Boston: Draper & Halliday. Philadelphia: Smith, English, & Co. Cincinnati: George S. Blanchard & Co. 1867. [New York, sold by N. Tibbals & Co.]

*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Exodus.* With a new Translation, by J. G. MURPHY, D.D., T.C.D., Professor of Hebrew, Belfast. Andover: Warren F. Draper. Boston: W. H. Halliday & Co. Philadelphia: Smith, English, & Co. [New York, sold by N. Tibbals & Co.]

We have long thought a commentary on the Old Testament from the ripest scholarship and the highest talent to be one of the most imperative demands of the day. But so rapid and so momentous have been the changes of the demands of science upon repeated reconsideration of previous interpretations, and so dubious have been the present aspects of science itself, that it is no wonder that the biblical scholar has paused before committing to record any new construction of the text to meet the scientific demand. We are gratified to say, nevertheless, that the two volumes before us are very brave and very successful adventures upon this stormy sea. Lange's *Genesis*, from the editorial hand of Professor Taylor Lewis, we are awaiting with high expectation; but thus far nothing has appeared in this country for half a century on the first two books of the Pentateuch so valuable as the present two volumes. Professor Murphy's scholarship is mature. He is original without eccentricity. His style is lucid, animated, and often eloquent. His pages afford golden suggestions and key thoughts. He is modern in his spirit, and at the time of his writing he seems to have been alive to all the latest utterances of science. Unsolved questions still remain; but we see our way clearly enough, and far enough, to realize the full assurance that the last effort of skepticism founded on science to disturb the ancient foundation of the grand old Book will end in total defeat.

Some of the laws of interpretation are stated with so fresh and natural a clearness and force that they will permanently stand. One of these laws is this: "The usage of common life determines the meaning of a word or phrase; not that of philosophy." "The usage of the time and place determines the meaning; not that of any other time; not modern usage." Commenting on the word

*land* in Gen. i, 2, he makes the following pregnant remarks: "We have further to bear in mind that the *land* among the antediluvians, and down far below the time of Moses, meant so much of the surface of our globe as was known by observation, along with an unknown and undetermined region beyond; and observation was not then so extensive as to enable men to ascertain its spherical form or even the curvature of its surface. To their eye it presented merely an irregular surface bounded by the horizon. Hence it appears that, so far as the current significance of this leading term is concerned, the scene of the six days' creation cannot be affirmed on scriptural authority alone to have extended beyond the surface known to man. Nothing can be inferred from the mere words of Scripture concerning America, Australia, the islands of the Pacific, or even the remote parts of Asia, Africa, or Europe, that were yet unexplored by the race of man. We are going beyond the warrant of the sacred narrative, on a flight of imagination, whenever we advance a single step beyond the sober limits of the usage of the day in which it was written."—P. 33. This of course presupposes an obviously limited biblical area. We easily see, then, that the affirmations in regard to the universality of the flood imply but a universality over the ground known to Scripture history. The existence of anthropoid races in other regions, or on other continents, is to be held in the negative until the affirmative is demonstrated either by Scripture text or scientific research.

Upon the first chapter of Genesis, however, when we say that Dr. Murphy advocates the theory of a week of *reconstruction* consisting of seven solar days, our readers who have noted our former utterances upon that subject will, of course, expect us to dissent. By that route no satisfactory results can be attained. We firmly believe in the canonical authority of that chapter, just as we believe in that of the Apocalypse; but we no more believe in the literal seven days of the former, than in the literal seven trumpets of the latter. Both seem symbols of successive stages of advancement in a great process. The six days are the six unfoldings of the created system in the natural order of contemplation, and probably in the natural order of creative development. First the *three* compartments are created, *ether*, *water*, and *land*; and then their *three* occupants, the *luminaries*, the *water tribes*, and the *land inhabitants*; and the sacred *seven* is consummated by the great repose or *permanence* which endures until now. And of that *process* and of that *permanence* every week and every Sabbath are our blessed reminders.

Prof. Murphy's treatment of the Edenic state, the fall, and the flood, furnishes suggestive remarks and luminous discussions. Eden is the center of the human creation. The serpent, possessed by the spirit of evil, is exalted to a supernatural position, from which he is remanded back to his natural degradation. Here Dr. Murphy omits to compare this instance with the cases of demoniac possession. But why not consider the serpent the mere form in which Satan made himself visible, (as he doubtless assumed a human form to our Saviour,) and then consider the divine curse as expressed in symbolical terms, drawn from the serpentine guise in which he is found? Dr. Murphy recognizes the importance of Gen. iii, 22-24, as proving that Adam's immortality of body was not absolute and intrinsic, but dependent upon his use of the tree of life. Thence we understand how he was deathless in spite of the fact that animal tribes had died for ages. Thence, too, Dr. Murphy explains antediluvian longevity, the vital power of the early use of that tree remained unspent for centuries. To this we may add, that connected with the tree of life as its center was the entire bloom of Eden; and by their proximity to Eden, through divine favor, the patriarchal line, from which Christ descended, may have possessed a longevity unknown to the tribes which scattered farthest abroad. Is there any analogy between the intense primitive vitality which produced the gigantic geologic forms and that which produced the antediluvian longevity?

Had man not sinned, by our author's view, the tree of life was so capable of expanding its influence as to vitalize the entire un-fallen race. If the flood was local, as Dr. Murphy supposes, the earliest and farthest wandering tribes—the "Turanean"—may have originated earlier than that event; for we cannot believe, with Dr. Murphy, that the antediluvian world was not very populous. It must also result, and is doubtless true, that the earth underwent no great change from the curse at the fall, though it lost the renovating influence of an overspreading Eden. Nor does it seem clear that we can accept the conception of some German theologians, that the disorder of the earth is due to the fall of Satan, for the same mixture of order and disorder reigns, so far as our observation can reach, through the entire material universe.

We heartily recommend these two volumes as the best approximation extant, within our knowledge, to the true ideal of a commentary on the first two books of the canon.

*The Resurrection of Life.* An Exposition of First Corinthians xv. With a Discourse on our Lord's Resurrection. By JOHN BROWN, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology to the United Presbyterian Church. Second Edition. 12mo., pp. 378. Edinburgh: William Oliphant & Co. 1866. [New York: Sold by N. Tibbals & Co.]

Dr. Brown was the author of a number of works considered as standard by the Presbyterians of Scotland. They are evidently marked by ability and learning, and especially by a rich evangelical power. The volume before us contains many paragraphs of vigorous thought, and abounds in striking quotations from the literatures of both ancient and modern times. It is largely, of course, from the very nature of the chapter it discusses, a treatment of the Scripture doctrine of the Resurrection, in which, we regret to say, we find more proofs of the author's ability than of the soundness of his views.

Dr. Brown quotes from Richard Winter Hamilton a disquisition upon the difference between *anastasis* and *egesis*, the two Greek words by which resurrection is expressed in the New Testament, which indicates that both of these gentlemen were better theologians than exegetes. Hamilton tells us that *anastasis* means "the reinstatement of the entire humanity of the individual in his future existence," that it does not usually refer to the body, and that it expresses not so much the *act* of *rising again* as the resurrection *state*. The noun *egesis*, with its verb form, expresses the simple *act*; and he refers to a list of texts as corroborating this interpretation. Now, in our view, this is a most erroneous piece of philology. The comparison of the two words is this: 1. *Anastasis* signifies, intransitively, an *uprising* from a previous lower *state* of the same subject. *Egesis* signifies, transitively, a *raising* of an object by some agent. It is only in its passive form as a verb, *is raised*, that it attains nearly the sense of *rising*; but even then the implication of the action of a causative agent is seldom or ever quite lost; or in its middle form, when its meaning is a *raising of one's self*. 2. Neither *anastasis* nor *egesis* explicitly expresses the risen state, or permanent condition resultant from the rising or raising. Both express simply and explicitly *the act alone*; but both do occasion the idea of the sequent state by the mind's supplying the implication that after the *rising* the *risen state* is permanent. But neither word ever entirely loses its primary designation of the *act*. Thus the passive verb form of *egesis* is repeatedly translated *is risen*, as Matt. xxvii, 64, and xxviii, 6, 7; or *am risen*, xxvi, 32; where the rising being explicitly expressed the permanent risen *state* is implied. A large share of the in-

stances of *egersis*, as well as of *anastasis*, are of this character. 3. Both are normally used of the resurrection act of the body; that is, of the actual rising or raising of the corporeal frame from its former lower state, the subject being the same in its previous fallen and its subsequent risen state.

The most curious part of the matter is, that these two writers construct this cumbrous pseudo-criticism to take away the idea of bodily resurrection from 1 Cor. xv, 12-19, where it does incontestably exist, since the reference there is to Christ's own bodily resurrection. These gentlemen plainly misunderstand the apostle's reasoning, and endeavor to correct misunderstanding by misconstruction. The apostle's reasoning is this: It is dangerous for some of you to say there is no bodily resurrection; for if there be no bodily resurrection Christ has not risen; and if Christ has not [bodily] risen, the foundation of the Christian faith is destroyed, and all our Christian hopes are a dream. We who hoped for justification, resurrection, and eternal salvation through him, are in our sins; and even those who have died in Christ have gone to the perdition of unjustified sinners. They have gone to that perdition, whatever, in this wreck of Christianity, it may truly be; whether the Gehenna, or the annihilation taught by the Jews, or the Tartarus of the pagan poets. And in this whole argument the apostle has no occasion to affirm or deny the immortality of the soul, or even the possible resurrection of the body without Christ. What he does affirm is, that to deny the resurrection of the body is to destroy the foundation of Christianity, and thereby all hope of pardon and eternal life through Christ.

Dr. Brown is, in our estimation, to be numbered among those who say "there is no resurrection;" for his resurrection is not a re-rising of the same body, but the substitution of a new one by a positive new creation. He asserts the real resurrection to be "demonstrably impossible," but does not give us the process by which the impossibility is demonstrated. For a most satisfactory solution of all these *impossibilities*, we refer to Dr. Mattison's able work on the Resurrection.

When the soul appears before the judgment-seat of Christ, it must come furnished with an organized material body. Whence is the substance of that body derived? From what part of the universe are the particles gathered to form in concretion around the naked spirit? We answer, they may just as well be the particles composing the body that died as any other. It is just as easy to Omnipotence. If they are not the same substance, then we have a fresh formation, a new creation, a substitution, and not

a resurrection, and the doctrine of the resurrection is denied. And all the subterfuges and writhing inventions to substitute something else besides the once existing body—some germ, some Swedenborgian phantasm, some outline sketch of a body contained in our present living body—are simply difficult efforts to remove difficulties in the actual doctrine of the resurrection which do not exist. That doctrine is contradicted by nothing in physics or metaphysics. So long as the doctrine of the indestructibility of matter—or, if you please, of “the persistence of force”—is true, so long the identity of matter through all ages is real, the identity of the body, consisting of sameness of substance, is a possibility, and if declared by revelation, is a truth.

---

*The Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels.* By ANDREWS NORTON. Abridged Edition. 12mo., pp. 584. Boston: American Unitarian Association. 1867.

The present volume is an abridgment for popular use of a larger work in three volumes by the same author; a work well known to biblical scholars, and creditable to the biblical scholarship of our country. It treats, as our readers will note, not the subject of Christian evidences generally, but specifically the question of the genuineness of the four Gospel documents; that is, it endeavors to settle the point affirmatively that the Gospels bearing the names of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were really written, certain well-known passages excepted, at the time usually supposed, and by the authors named. Whether they are also true—though in an eloquent peroration the author deduces that inference with great beauty and force—is not the question immediately discussed. The thorough biblical scholar will desiderate the full work where the critical minutiae of the argument are given in full detail; but for ordinary students and readers, this is a very interesting and very valuable volume.

For the first half century after the death of John, as all antiquity agrees in dating that event, Christian documents are almost totally wanting. Hence a loose and sweeping assertion is often made by adverse pseudo-criticism that there is no evidence of the existence of the four Gospels before the latter half of the second century. This first half century, with its blank of documents, is the battle-ground of evidences.

There are not wanting during this blank period Christian writings that have no occasion to mention the Gospels; writings that really assume the great Gospel facts, and breathe the Gospel spirit, and express the Gospel doctrines. And in the Epistles of Paul,



written probably earlier than some of the Gospels, the Gospel history is assumed, and most of these epistles are admitted by the most unscrupulous criticism to be genuine; so that the religion existed independently of the Gospels, and may be proved even if the Gospels are of doubtful genuineness. Still, the present point is the genuineness of the Gospels.

But the last half of the second century opens upon us a splendid Christian literature. The illustrious names of Irenæus in France, of Clement of Alexandria, of Tertullian of Carthage, and of Theophilus of Antioch, spread a glory over this period. They arise at once in very distant regions of the earth, and write in different languages. Yet these learned and able men recognize the Gospels, with a theory of inspiration that might satisfy Gilbert Haven, as a conclusive authority to settle fact and doctrine. They were all born in the earlier half of the century. But they have no knowledge, no traditional account, no existing record of any doubt that the four Gospels are the four productions of the four reputed authors. This evidence covers, therefore, in reality, the first half century; and it is evidence which would be conclusive as to the authorship of any other books. And these writers testify that these documents have been preserved in the great metropolitan Churches with sacred care from their first publication. Lines of bishops or pastors have handed them down authentically. Translations in different languages have been made. And Mr. Norton logically calculates that at least there were at this period three million Christians and sixty thousand copies of the Gospels extant in different parts of the globe. Nor there are any Gospels or Christian histories that come into anything like what can be called a competition with the standard four.

And now for the first half century. Over this period stretches the life of Justin Martyr, a native of Palestine, a converted philosopher, an eminent Christian writer. He testifies that the *Gospels were read every Sunday as Christian Scripture throughout the Christian world*. Within this period Papias names Matthew and Mark as authors of the Gospels that bear their names; and Tatian made his Harmony of the four. Every probability is, that in this half century the earliest translations into Latin and Syriac were made. Tischendorf has lately shown that there are traces in the earliest versions indicating revisions of the text that must have been made in this first half century, carrying us up nearly to the time of the Apostle John. Thus the blank of this first half century is well filled.

But a peculiarity of Mr. Norton's work is the great prominence which he gives to an evidence from an entirely different quarter, and which commences as early as the year 117. At this time the Gnostics were fairly in recognized existence as a heretical minority in the Christian Church. Their principles rendered the Gospels an obstacle in their way. They would have been gainers could they have invalidated their authority, and the orthodox writers would have promptly charged it upon them had they attempted to repudiate them. Now these Gnostics accepted the Gospels as authentic and authoritative. They never questioned their genuineness, but sought to interpret them in their own way. It was, therefore, by no religious conspiracy, no ecclesiastical compact, that the four sole Gospels were selected or adopted, or attributed to their authors. They were authenticated by evidence compelling admission by those who would have been glad to deny. And the unwilling testimony of these Gnostics demonstrates the existence of the Gospels through the first half century.

It is upon this part of the subject that Mr. Norton is most copious. He expatiates upon the Gnostics as if enamored of his theme, until his work becomes ecclesiastical history, rather than apologetics. His statements are clear and full of interest, and are brought to bear in great force upon the argument. Mr. Norton is free of speech in irrelevantly asserting his trenchant Unitarianism. With that drawback, his work may be well recommended to our readers interested in this department of thought.

---

*Eccle Ecclesia.* An Essay, showing the Essential Identity of the Church in all Ages. 8vo., pp. 576. New York: Blelock & Co. 1868.

There never has been but one true Church, the Messianic, in the world. "Christianity is as old as the creation." Adam was a Christian, and every true Jew was justified by faith in the atonement. Such are the truths which Dr. Deems asserts and illustrates in this volume with great clearness and force. But to these propositions there are certain antithetic formulæ, which are equally true. This one true Church has under successive dispensations been several successive Churches. Christianity took its origin at the Christian era. Adam was a patriarch, and not a Christian. And theologians discuss with great and just doubt how far the ancient Israelites understood the great final atonement to be foreshadowed by their sacrificial system. Dr. Deems is a man of genius. Whatever he speaks, writes, or thinks, is spoken, written, or thought with much intensity. But he sees sometimes a part so vividly as to miss the comprehensive whole, and thereby mistakes the an-

tithetic for the contradictory. His book is mainly occupied with assuming or maintaining that of the above two sets of propositions, the former contradicts and excludes the latter.

From the same intensity Dr. Deems brings all the affirmers of the latter propositions to a very sharp issue, and holds them responsible in somewhat peremptory terms for great fallibilities. In studying his table of contents, in order to ascertain the great outline of his volume, we were struck with the summary style in which the most eminent theologians in his way were upset. His running titles are "Error of Watson," "Mistake of Mr. Watson," "Error of Dr. G. Smith," "Very Erroneous and Unguarded Teachings of Dr. A. Clarke," "Marvelous Errors of Dr. Nevin," "Blunder of Mr. Burkett and Others," "Absurdity of Buck's Dictionary," etc., etc. The method by which Dr. Deems annihilates all these errors is by opposing one set of the above propositions to the other, and, assuming the contradictoriness of their nature, to hold the assertors as blunderheads.

Let us take a fair specimen. Mr. Watson is quoted as saying, "The Christian religion was published by its great Author in Judea a short time before the death of Herod," etc. To this Dr. Deems responds, "No, sir; that is not the proper understanding of it. This is the fact, as Mr. Watson himself will not deny. The Christian religion, that is, *the religion* now called by the name of 'Christianity,' was published by its great Author to all mankind in the days of Adam, several thousand years before Herod was born," etc., page 311.

Again, three or four paragraphs are quoted from a published sermon by Bishop Wightman of the Church, South, beginning with this just and true sentence: "The term *New Testament* sets the Gospel dispensation in contradistinction to the Law, which was the Old Testament." The bishop then proceeds to show, with perfect accuracy of thought and language, that the ministers of the New Testament are a new and a very different institute from the priesthood of the Old. Dr. Deems responds, "The Old Testament and the New, then, are in contradistinction to each other; that is to say, they are not only *different*, as a treatise on geography and one on astronomy are different, but they are *contrary*, in opposition to each other. And he tells us further that they 'both proceed from God.' This looks to me impossible. How can any two things coming from God stand *contra* to each other?"

One would suppose that Dr. Deems had learned long since that contraries are not necessarily contradictories, and that contradistinction is not contradiction. The opposite poles are *contra* to

each other, yet both came from God. The entire argument against Bishop Wightman is too extended for our limits. The remainder is just as conclusive as the part we have given. And of the general mode of reasoning these are, we think, average examples. We do not think that the prevalent conception among our best theologians of the relation between the old and new dispensations is incorrect; nevertheless there are frequent careless statements which Dr. Deems's keen criticisms are well calculated to castigate and correct. For that purpose his work is valuable.

---

*The Works of Christ; or, The Atonement, considered in its Influence upon the Intelligent Universe.* By ENOCH M. MARVIN, D.D., one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. 24mo., pp. 137. St. Louis: P. M. Pinckard. 1867.

This little volume by Bishop Marvin, of the Church South, is an outline theodicy. It is a concise presentation of the theory of divine justice in the government of the world, as exhibited in the Christian system, including the atonement. The bishop's logic is clear, and his style nervous, and sometimes eloquent. He writes mainly in short, graphic, trenchant sentences, in the first person singular, with a very subjective spirit; so that the reader seems to overhear a series of systematic individual meditations through which the mind passes in attaining a symmetrical view of a just divine government.

The great outline of the bishop's argument is truly Arminian and soundly orthodox. It is standard in its value, and may well be recommended to the study of our young ministry, and our laymen who desire to see a brief fundamental statement of the reasonableness of their own system of faith.

---

*Theological Index.* References to the Principal Works in every Department of Religious Literature. Embracing nearly seventy thousand Citations, alphabetically arranged under two thousand Heads. By HOWARD MALCOLM, D. D., LL.D. 8vo., pp. 487. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. London: Trübner & Co. 1868.

Dr. Malcolm's volume is a unique and very valuable book of reference. He thinks truly that it will be a great convenience to authors, students, and purchasers of books for libraries. Perhaps we are not adding a fourth class when we say that reviewers may find it a great aid in "reading up" for an article for our Quarterly. It is a noble achievement that a work commenced by the learned author for his own private convenience, and continued as occasion demanded through the large share of his professional life, should have attained from his single hand so great a magnitude and com-

plateness. It is drawn up, too, so far as we can see, with an impartiality which renders it equally acceptable to believers in every creed, and which would render it difficult to guess what is the creed of the author.

---

*The Epistle to the Hebrews.* With Explanatory Notes. To which are added a Condensed View of the Priesthood of Christ, and a Translation of the Epistle, prepared for this work. By HENRY J. RIPLEY, late Professor in Newton Theological Institute, and Author of "Notes on the Gospels," "Acts of the Apostles," "Epistle to the Romans," etc., etc. 12mo., pp. 213. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. New York: Sheldon & Co. Cincinnati: Geo. S. Blanchard & Co. 1868.

This is one of a series forming a popular yet scholarly commentary on the New Testament by the learned Baptist professor. It is exegetical rather than theological, the author seldom, if ever, having any particular creed under his attention. He does not apply i, 8, to prove the divinity of Christ as against Unitarianism, nor argue to show that vi, 4-6, does not prove a real and total apostasy from true piety as against Arminianism. He does not decide upon the question of the authorship of the epistle, but recognizing its apostolic character, seems to hold that while Paul may be author of the thoughts, some other hand may have clothed them in language. Such is clearly the problem. Pauline thought in an un-Pauline style.

---

*American Edition of Dr. William Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.* Revised and Edited by Professor H. B. HACKETT, D. D. With the co-operation of EZRA ABBOTT, A.M., A.A.S., Assistant Librarian of Harvard University. Parts 7 and 8. 8vo. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867.

The present two numbers of this noble Bible Dictionary extend from the article on Egypt to that on Gennesaret. The principal articles are Elijah, Elisha, Embalming, Book of Enoch, Ephesians, Esdras, Esther, Exodus, Ezekiel, Ezra, Gadara, Galatians, Genealogy, and Genesis. The standard character of this work is, of course, well known to our readers. Hurd & Houghton are rapidly pressing it forward to completion.

---

### *Foreign Theological Publications.*

*Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengeschichte seit der Restauration von 1814.* [*Manual of Modern Church History since the Restoration of 1814.*] By F. NIPPOLD, Privatdocent of Theology at the University of Heidelberg. 8vo., pp. xv, 484. Elberfeld, 1867.

The most important work produced by Schenkel's young school. The author attempts to show, by the recent history of the Church itself, that the Church has fallen into a lifeless eccle-

siastical form purely because it has neglected to seize and use the culture of the times. He affirms that he writes independently of every party-standpoint, and yet the bias of the skeptical partisan is perceptible on almost every page. His book is in perfect conformity with the programme of the Protestant Unions, (societies organized by Schenkel within the Church for the real purpose of abolishing all adherence to confessional authority,) and is directed mainly to the intelligent laity, who are assumed to have become perfectly disgusted with the whole mass of confessional ecclesiasticism into which the orthodox Church is claimed to have tumbled. It is lamentable to see such a man as Rothe, whose *Ethik* had justly entitled him to the good name he enjoyed until addled by Schenkel's sophistries, writing a highly commendatory preface to Mr. Nippold's history, and intimating that the orthodox theologians of the present time would make the Church of the nineteenth century cleave to the errors of the sixteenth. And Mr. Nippold himself ignores the whole work of the Reformation and the Protestant Church when he affirms "that it is the Modern State which has triumphed over the Middle Ages." If he is to be believed, then we must give politics, and not Christianity, the credit of having saved us from medieval darkness, and the corruptions of Popery in its worst forms.

After the Introduction, the work is divided into three books, as follows: Book First, the Results of Previous Development, and the Nature of the new Epochs; Book Second, the Latest Church History of Catholicism, (1) History of the Papacy; (2) History of the State Churches outside of Germany; (3) History of German Catholicism; Book Third, the latest Church History of Protestantism, (1) the History of German Theology; (2) History of the German Church; (3) History of the Greek Church, and of Protestantism beyond Germany. In the section on the Orthodox Schools of Theology there is the confession that an orthodox revival has occurred in the English, Swiss, French, and Dutch Churches; but there is coupled with it a sneer at its practical character, as if the theology arising from it were so practical and commonplace as to exclude a really scientific character. The present school of orthodox theologians is unequally described, but this is one of the very best and, generally, most impartial portions of the work. The sketch of Hengstenberg is an exception, however, and is more unfair than any other of Mr. Nippold's portraits.

Having described the evangelical leaders, and grouped them into schools, (following Schwartz throughout, *Geschichte der neuesten Theologie*), the author arrives at the conclusion that none



of these schools "can effect a regeneration of the crushed theology of Protestantism." As the Church has withdrawn itself from culture, culture has withdrawn itself from the Church; there must be a remarriage, or the Church will inevitably suffer shipwreck and utter ruin. The orthodoxy of the present day is described as a return to the Pietism of Spener's time; it is exclusively private Christianity, and is bent on restoring confessionalism in its strongest character: it is an excessive exaltation of the circumference, and an unpardonable neglect of the center: in a word, it is the wretched legacy we have received from Roman Catholicism. The Church is no more what it once was—the supporter of Christian ideas. It is constantly ceasing to be the center of all religious efforts, while these efforts are now being chiefly made by Humanitarians operating independently of the Church. This assumption might be excused in any writer whose eye is supposed to be closed to the facts of recent ecclesiastical history. In the present instance it betrays Mr. Nippold's unpardonable ignorance of his chosen theme. . . . Excise the orthodox Church-members from all the charitable associations of Great Britain and the United States, and the Humanitarian treasury would soon be hopelessly empty. It is the evangelical Church which, directly or indirectly, is now conducting the greatest benevolent organization of our century, and Mr. Nippold could see this if he would, from an example near at home, the Gustavus Adolphus Association.

There are features of this Church History which we admire; it is plain-spoken, direct, and aims to reduce the facts of recent date to principles. It shows us just what we did not know before, and what it was important to know as soon as possible, namely, the verdict of the culture-worshippers on the whole evangelical movement foreshadowed by Schleiermacher, marked out by Neander, and followed up by Tholuck and the whole class of evangelical theologians on the continent. To upset this verdict will need effort of stronger men than the author of this work, and their negative success, as with all thrusts against error, will be so much positive gain.

But we cannot close our notice of Mr. Nippold's history without a protest against his misrepresentation of Methodism. He quotes no English or American authorities, and is probably ignorant of the English language. We can excuse him, therefore, only on the ground of being compelled to rely on German authorities, who, almost without exception, have notoriously misrepresented Methodism. He says the divisions among the Wesleyans of England have arisen from "the withdrawal of the more pious from

the less pious," and the Primitive Wesleyans are now the important section! The fact is, the Primitives have scarcely a quarter of a million of members and less than seven hundred preachers, while the Wesleyans have nearly six hundred thousand members, and twenty-eight hundred preachers in the active work. (See *Wesleyan Minutes* for 1866.) The statistics of American Methodism are also underrated, while our camp-meetings are described as "really German Pietism in its grosser form," to which thousands of people stream from different quarters and spend five or six days in "groaning, screaming, howling, and having convulsions." These things must be so, Mr. Nippold concludes, for it is the unanimous testimony of such men as Graul, Gieseler, and Gerstäcker. The only consideration which reconciles us to such outrageous falsehoods is the fact that, in giving a fulsome laudation of Unitarianism, he presents it as the opposite pole to Methodism in the United States, a judgment to which we readily submit, with all proper thanks to the judge.

---

*Apologetische Beiträge.* Zweiter Beitrag.—Die göttlichen Geheimnisse: 1. Gott und seine Schöpfung. 2. Der Mensch und seine Sünde. [*Apologetic Contributions. Second Contribution.* 1. *God and his Creation.* 2. *Man and his Sin.*] By Dr. FRIEDRICH DÜSTERDIECK. 8vo., pp. 116. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. 1867.

In the Introduction there is a sharp analysis of the different kinds of knowledge. Faith is just as much knowledge as the knowledge communicated by reason or the senses. The antithesis between faith and reason is the central point of the severe conflict now in progress between orthodoxy and infidelity: formally stated, the person, work, and history of Jesus on the one side, and the actualness, historical development, and moral order of revelation on the other, are the two main subjects about which faith and unbelief have gathered their respective combatants. The skeptics promise a religion of humanity, a promise they can never fulfill. The best way to refute the deistical, pantheistic, and materialistic tendencies of the age is to enforce the Christian idea of God, the personal Spirit and Lord who reveals.

The present work embraces the two general heads: 1. God and his Creation; and, 2. Man and his Sin. All the present false views of man's nature and responsibility, the author holds, arise from false views of God. Human guilt and corruption are clearly taught and enforced by correct conceptions of Deity. In order to understand God sufficiently for our salvation the element of faith is absolutely necessary; the Scriptures nowhere teach that God was

apprehended correctly by a nation or individual who was not in fellowship with him. The absence of communion necessitated the absence of a correct conception of his character. Language is incapable of conveying a sufficient knowledge of him, and the defect must be supplied by the heart's apprehension of him as Saviour and Friend. There is a partial revelation of God's character in the name itself, and the terms which God always used in speaking of himself; but he is most completely revealed by the Son, between whom and the believer there must be a warm, living fellowship. There must be a reception of Christ's life as having of God. 1 John ii, 23; iv, 15. The New Testament representation of God is not opposed to that of the Old, but carries the latter to perfect development; the New Testament is not the abrogation but the fulfillment of the Old; miracles are not peculiar and abnormal methods of God's operation, but in harmony with his laws. The only absolute miracle that ever occurred is creation; all others are subordinate to it, for it was the germ of all. Hence, faith in miracles is not a special faith; he who believes in a personal, divine Creator cannot deny them. He must accept them if he accept the existence and work of the Divine Being. In looking at the great question of sin, its most difficult point is when and how it commenced. Is God good—then he had no part in originating it; for he hates sin and gave his Son to redeem from it. It was man's own act that brought sin into the world and imbedded it in his nature; so must it be by his own act that he can derive advantage from the great remedy provided for its destruction. To know God aright, and to be delivered from our corrupt nature, we must embrace Christ in his historical character as Redeemer and in his present character as Mediator.

The work as a whole is a happy blending of the argumentative and the practical.

---

*Compendium der Dogmatik.* [*Compendium of Dogmatic Theology.*] By Dr. Ch. E. LUTHARDT, Consistorial Counselor, Professor of Theology. Second Edition. Leipzig: Dörfling und Franke. 1866.

We have here a restatement of Christian faith in reply to certain claims of skepticism. This *compendium*, standing beside Hase's *Hutterus Redivivus* and Schmid's *Ecclesiastical Dogmatics*, is more popular and clear than either of these works; and it is not at all surprising that a second edition has been called for in less than a year after the appearance of the first, a compliment paid by Germany to but few of her multitude of writers. The treatment

is analogous to Hase's work in deriving its dogmatic definitions from present systems; and, in giving a history of dogmatics, is unlike Schmid, who confines himself merely to ecclesiastical dogmatics. Luthardt gives considerable freedom to the doctrine of predestination, and his views have therefore met with the censure of some Calvinistic Lutherans. He adopts the very unpredestinarian method of only treating this dogma after his discussion of the creation, adding, by way of apology, that Lutheran doctrinal writers give this doctrine place after the doctrine of sin, but "as an *actio Dei interna et immanens*, it belongs before the *actiones externæ*." But it is more in the definition than in the place he assigns the doctrine itself that the doctor incurs the displeasure of his predestinarian critics. Of predestination he says, in concluding his examination of the doctrine, "*The fundamental error, from the beginning down to the present time, has been the too intimately connecting it with individuals instead of with humanity*, as God will have it in Christ, into whose communion we can only come by faith as individuals. But then this is not a special and particular revelation, but only the historical revelation of the same." In other words, Luthardt, now one of the leading men in the Lutheran Church of Germany, repudiates the old form of predestination, and modifies it into a general divine purpose, which will not suffer humanity to be divided, but will only regard it as a unit.

---

*Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte.* [Manual of Church History, with Constant Reference to the Development of Doctrine.] By H. E. F. GUERICKE. 9th Edition. Vol. II. Medieval Church History. Pp. 320. Leipzig: W. Engelmann. 1866.

Guericke's work is already favorably known to the American public through Professor Shedd's translation; but the present part of a new edition (from Gregory the Great, year 590, to the conclusion of the general Lateran Council, in 1517) is a great improvement upon the corresponding one of the American edition. The great value of Guericke's Church History is its constant reference to doctrinal history. In fact, it is a concurrent history of doctrine, and in this respect it stands well nigh alone. The present volume is a treatment of the Church of the Middle Ages, under the two general heads of the Ecclesiastical Middle Age before its bloom, (from the seventh to the eleventh century,) and the Ecclesiastical Middle Age since its bloom, (from the end of the eleventh to the beginning of the sixteenth century.) The final chapter on the doctrinal history of two specific periods furnishes a fair specimen of the method of the work. The subject is, the

Ecclesiastical Development of Single Doctrines. First, the Scholastic Period. Under this head, God, Anthropology, Christology, and Soteriology, the Church and its Sacraments, are treated. Second, the Ante-Reformation Period, under which God, the Church, and the sacraments are treated. The work concludes with a minute chronological table of Church history, in twelve pages.

---

*History, Biography, and Topography.*

*A Memoir of the Life and Labors of Francis Wayland, D.D., LL.D., Late President of Brown University.* Including Selections from his Personal Reminiscences and Correspondence. By his sons, FRANCIS WAYLAND and H. L. WAYLAND. In two volumes. Pp. 429, 379. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1867.

These are precious volumes, perpetuating the memory of a good and great man, and, as the dedication to his pupils, parishioners, and friends truly says, confirming the lesson so often taught by him, "that nothing on earth is so divine as a life devoted to the service of God and the welfare of man." The biographies of but few men will be so heartily welcomed, and read with so delighted an interest by all classes, as this. As a minister and prominent leader in the Baptist denomination his name is loved throughout their million of members; as an educator, standing for thirty years at the head of one of the principal colleges in the country, he powerfully aided in forming the intellectual character of many hundreds of students, and in molding prevailing systems of academic and popular education; his text-books, of which "The Elements of Moral Science," with its abridgment, alone, has reached a circulation of nearly one hundred and forty thousand copies, made him a revered but familiar friend in most of our institutions of learning for many years, and gave his name an authority among intelligent youth everywhere; his large heart and philanthropic spirit caused him to be regarded as in sympathy with whatever could promote the welfare of humanity.

Few men of his time contributed more than he to the intellectual and moral culture of the nation. This Memoir may, therefore, be regarded as filling an important place in our national biographic literature.

The sons of Dr. Wayland have performed a labor of love in the preparation of these volumes. Their intimate relationship to, and deep affection for him, do not seem to have influenced them in their delineation of his character, except it may be in restraining them, where others might have spoken in terms of eulogy. Indeed, they insert freely, though not too much so, the expressions



of others laudatory of his character, words, and works. Dr. Wayland's autobiographic narrative, his correspondence, and materials furnished by friends, make up the body of the Memoir; the work of the authors being chiefly to select, arrange in proper order, and supply the connecting links. They have, with scarcely an exception, done their task well. They make us acquainted with the Christian, the student, the tutor, the preacher, the pastor, the president, the writer, the citizen, the friend, the father, the patriot, the saint; but we lay down the work with the feeling that of his inner and private life we know too little to give us a just comprehension of him.

Dr. Wayland was born in 1796, and died in 1865. After graduating at Union College in 1813, he pursued the study of medicine; but he had hardly entered upon its practice, when his conversion and call to the ministry of the Gospel changed his entire future life. We find him in 1816 a student at Andover, but, pinched by poverty, at the end of the year he left the seminary for a tutorship in Union College. This post he retained until invited to a pastoral charge in Boston, in 1821. Here for five years he labored, not popular as a preacher, but loved as a pastor, careful, methodical, earnest, and severely studious. His sermon on "The Moral Dignity of the Missionary Enterprise," which when published brought him, at the age of twenty-seven, prominently before the public, and marked an era in the history of missions, seems to have fallen nearly dead upon the audience that listened to it. In 1826 he became a professor in Union College, but three months afterward accepted the presidency of Brown University, the duties of which he performed with all fidelity until age and an overtasked brain compelled his resignation in 1855.

Dr. Wayland was not so much a man of brilliant genius, as of large and massy intellect. Few men owe less to adventitious circumstances, or to influential personal friends. He was, with his great powers, a patient, conscientious, plodding, indefatigable worker. What is worth doing at all, he thought worth doing thoroughly. This principle had controlled him in his pastorate; he carried it into the recitation and lecture rooms, and the whole system of the college. Whether the college existed at all or not, he said, was none of his concern. His duty was, so long as it did exist, to make it a *good* college. The vessel might sink, but if so, it should sink with all its colors flying. His personal example illustrated his exhortations to his pupils, to do their work as well as possible, and to make the best use of their powers. Such say-



ings as, "All that I have ever accomplished was by day's works," and, "Nothing can stand before day's works," so frequently uttered by him, could not fail to inspire young men around him to follow his steps. From positions of eminence and usefulness they to-day ascribe their success to such teachings.

For the metaphysics of theology Dr. Wayland had no time, and, perhaps, no taste. As late as 1848 he had never read any of Calvin's works, or anything on controversial theology. He called himself a moderate Calvinist; he dared not assent to the logical conclusions of the system. "The sharp angles of Calvinism," he said, "which need to be filed and hammered out in order to make a system, I desire to hold no opinion about." He was a Baptist, "an old-fashioned Baptist," he was wont to say. He was such from "conscientious and intelligent conviction," his biographers assert; and we should be sorry were it otherwise. But, judging from the two or three passages in the Memoir touching his views of infant baptism, passages which Dr. Wayland would not, were he living, thank the authors for inserting, he seems to have based his convictions upon a very partial study of the subject. It is certainly amusing to note the gravity with which they narrate a little passage between the young theologian in his first year at the seminary and Professor Stuart, the whole point of which is in the pupil's confounding a mental temper passively existing, and the same temper actively exercised. On his views respecting communion, upon which there is a growing disagreement in the denomination, the biography is prudently silent; and, more strangely, perhaps, his "Notes on the Principles and Practices of the Baptist Churches" contains no allusion to the subject. It is understood, however, that he was theoretically and practically an open communionist, as are not a few of the leading ministers and laymen of that Church. He could not well be otherwise. From bigotry he was always singularly free. Many of his most cherished intimacies were found in other Churches than his own; and the longer he lived, the more did his catholic spirit expand and glow.

To the close of his life Dr. Wayland was a man of practice, not of theory. Relieved from the care of the college, he must still work. His soul burned for the salvation of men and the glory of Christ. His "Sermons to the Churches," "Letters on the Ministry," the biographies of Judson and Chalmers, and other publications, exhibit his deep concern in the spiritual work of the Church. Nothing is more touching in his whole history than his laying aside his plans of study, his books, and his pen, when

more than sixty years of age, assuming the pastoral charge of the Church in which he was a member, and for a year and a half discharging its duties with an assiduity, fidelity, and zeal that are seldom witnessed even in the young and vigorous. He considered nothing done unless the people were saved. His fervor was as apostolic in the prison, among the criminal and vile, as in the pulpit. And to the last, his interest was an active one in behalf of every philanthropic institution or cause; in everything that pertained to human welfare he felt a responsibility.

We commend these volumes to the perusal of our readers, assuring them of not only a pleasant entertainment for a few leisure hours, but of a profit which ought to be derived from the survey of a career so excellent and grand.

D. A. W.

---

*Life of Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts.* By his son, EDMUND QUINCY. 12mo., pp. 552. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1867.

Mr. Quincy's life stretches its long line over the entire length of the constitutional existence of our national government. His recollections at death could tie together the administrations of Washington and Lincoln. We miss all mention of the fact in the present volume; but, unless our recollections are incorrect, De Quincy, the English author, claims the American Quincys as a branch of his family, and that the family can trace its pedigree to the time of the Norman conquest.

Mr. Quincy entered Congress during the presidency of Jefferson, and continued until near the close of the War of 1812. He was the able leader of the Federal party in the House of Representatives while in Congress. Specimens of his oratory are given, which rank high, but not highest in parliamentary eloquence. We miss a passage which we used to admire greatly in our younger days, describing the *liberty* our fathers loved in contrast with the "embargoed liberty" of the Jeffersonian dynasty. Mr. Quincy was a true and conscientious patriot. Yet in a part of his career he not only opposed the declaration of war against England, but in his speech against the invasion of Canada he labored to hamper and defeat the administration in carrying on the war. To oppose the invasion of Canada because, as a province, it was not the author of the war, was not only unstatesmanlike, but factious reasoning. For the time being he was an unequivocal "copperhead;" and even the Hartford Convention men looked upon him as decidedly too ultra. It is no wonder that the Federal party, which at first was the noblest and purest party the country ever saw, after peace returned was never forgiven by the country. Its great rival triumphed until it

was first weakened by its subserviency to slavery, and then ruined by a still deeper copperheadism from which it is little likely ever to recover.

It was a great proof of Mr. Quincy's perspicacity that he early saw that slavery was the key of American politics. And we may here say, that the close of the late civil war is the termination of the great reaction of the two sections of our country in favor of a genuine democracy. Each section in turn has compelled the other to bring its aristocracy to a level. Let us explain our meaning.

At the close of the Revolution there were two dominant classes: the one in the North was an aristocracy of wealth and family overlying an uneducated and, in a degree, a disfranchised commonalty; that in the South was an oligarchy based upon a system of slavery founded in color. As the very broadest maxims of human equality, borrowed in some degree from the school of revolutionary France, were then current, adopted by Jefferson and his followers, one would have supposed that the oligarchy would have been the first to fall. Quite otherwise. The oligarchy had the skill to stand forth the apostles of broad democracy—to proclaim that all men were born free and equal, and yet to secure that their own slave system should be at least a temporary exception. Then, as in our own day, all allusion to the dark, "damned spot," was prohibited under pain of a violent silencer. The maxim that all men are free and equal, as proclaimed by these apostles, meant in the North that the pauper was as good for a voter as the millionaire; in the South it meant that each slaveholder was to have as good a vote as any other slaveholder. The Northern commonalty gladly, and very unanimously, accepted the doctrine in both of its antithetic meanings. It accepted the support of slavery, or enforced silence on that subject, on condition of its own complete enfranchisement. Hence, when Mr. Jefferson came into power the Federalists found their foundations rapidly giving way, and even had the mortification to lose Massachusetts herself. When Mr. Quincy entered Congress his party was bankrupt in power, and soon, by its factious course, became bankrupt in honor. For almost a generation the country reposed under the sway of democracy and slavery. But at last came the terrible reaction.

Prescient men began to realize that the oligarchy of a section was fast becoming the oligarchy over the nation. While the inhumanity of the system, proclaiming its purpose of perpetuating itself, awakened the earnest opposition of conscientious men, its dictatorial and despotic character alarmed true patriots at the North. Southern menaces of disunion for a while deterred, but finally

roused the Northern feeling. Yet to the last the political North dreamed of compromise, and never dreamed of sectional war. The first long-prepared blow from the South found the North not only unarmed, but disarmed by her democratic administration, and weighed down by the incubus of her democratic president; and shameful defeat not only attested her past insensibility to danger, but revealed to her the magnitude of the contest, and fixed her purpose to prosecute it to the bitter end. Not until compelled by stress of war did she give the blow which took the Southern "democracy" at its ancient word, and broke the chains of slavery. Not even then did the "radical" political party purpose the enfranchisement of the negro. That final measure is still in process, and was never adopted until the North was convinced by the massacres of New Orleans and Memphis that the only method to save the negro race from extermination was enfranchisement. The completion of that work is the completion of the double revolution by which the two sections have mutually "democratized" each other.

There are two pictures of Mr. Quincy in the book, a younger and an elder, the latter presenting the more noble-looking manhood. His character in age reminds us of the noble Roman examples quoted by Cicero in his *De Senectute*. As to his religious character, the account given by his son is blank and bleak enough. He attended Dr. Channing's Church and admired his eloquence; but he ostentatiously declined, in a public speech before the Harvard Corporation, being called a Unitarian, as too sectarian. This was not liberality, but—a very different thing—*liberalism*. It was a hit at all organized Christianity. In that sense not only Paul but Jesus was sectarian. In the same way, had Mr. Quincy been as true an indifferentist in politics as in religion, he ought to have declined the name of Federalist as being partisan. Even in his closing days we infer that he communed more with pagan than with Christian antiquity. We apprehend that in religion Mr. Quincy far more nearly approximated the *virtus*, the Roman integrity, of Cicero than the Christianity of Wayland. When the Christian makes his exit in triumphant faith we rejoice with calm assurance. But the problem of mere pagan integrity in a Christian age and land we leave, in the individual case, to be solved by the final Judge.

---

*The American Ecclesiastical Almanac for Ministers and Laymen for 1868.* By Prof. ALEXANDER J. SCHEM. 12mo., pp. 80. New York: Frederick Gerhard.

The external material and execution of this almanac is an offense to all esthetic sensibility and a crucifixion to weak eyes. But did the patronage sustain the accomplished author in constructing his

plan upon a scale commensurate with the matter and style of which our readers are aware he is capable, he would furnish to the public a valuable work increasing in value from year to year, until, from an ecclesiastical almanac it would grow to an ecclesiastical history. We earnestly wish him the means of fully realizing his noblest conception.

The leading topic at our next General Conference is justly said to be lay representation. And here we may say that we think that the excellent spirit, and the absence of partisanship which, thus far, (with some exceptions in our hebdomadals,) has characterized the movement, is a matter of just congratulation. The lay speeches, especially at our great meetings east and west, are certainly so loyal, so genial toward our ministry, so entirely non-partisan, that we think they justly go far to soothe the fears of the doubtful. The Church need feel it no inauspicious day when such true sons take seats in her highest legislation.

Yet we deprecate movements of haste and doubtful constitutionality. Should the reference again to the people's vote be refused, there is great danger that the annual conferences (whose approval has largely been conditioned on the Church's expression of wish) would reject the movement by a most disastrous vote. Should the General Conference assume to pass the measure without reference to either people or annual conference it would be considered an unequivocal *coup d'etat*. If brought before the courts of law it would probably be pronounced a nullity. Slow and sure is the word. Give the Church time for thought to work; take the calm, unquestionable course, and the measure will be adopted with the ease of a natural process in a healthy body.

---

*Leaves from the Journal of Our Life in the Highlands, from 1848 to 1861; To which are prefixed and added Extracts from the same Journal giving an Account of Earlier Visits to Scotland, and Tours in England and Ireland, and Yatching Excursions.* Edited by ARTHUR HELPS. 12mo., pp. 287. New York: Harper & Brothers. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1868.

Mr. Helps, on one of his official visits to Balmoral, as clerk of the Privy Council, was shown some extracts from Queen Victoria's Journal, in which he expressed so much interest that her Majesty conceived the purpose of printing them privately for her family and intimate friends. She finally yielded to the urgent solicitations of those around her and consented to their publication, in the hope of affording a gratification to her loving people. The plan was enlarged after the printing was commenced, and extracts added describing her tours in England, Ireland, and the Channel Islands.

Were we disposed to a rigid criticism of this volume, the candid



objection urged by Queen Victoria to its publication, namely, that she had no skill whatever in authorship, and her reluctance to publish anything written by her own pen, would surely disarm us. It is better to take it in the spirit in which it is given us. Royal personages are not wont to lay open their private life to the inspection of the people, or to desire their sympathy in the pursuits and pleasures of their leisure hours; but Queen Victoria spreads before them the records of her home life and joys, written freely and from the heart, and never designed for publicity. That she was more than willing to present the virtues of the Prince Consort in private life to the admiration of her subjects, and thus embalm his memory in their hearts, is doubtless true; and in this the loving woman and wife commands our admiration.

The constant references to him with not unfrequent affectionate adjectives; the record of his sayings and doings, as though he was her law; her love for Balmoral, because it was "his own creation;" the pet names, as "Bertie," "Vicky," and "Affie," by which the children were called; the kindly feeling pervading the entire household, exhibit the private life of a royal family controlled by virtue, goodness, and love. The volume is a very fitting continuation of the Memoir of the Prince Consort, giving us not a few glimpses of the subsequent career, the opening chapters of which are there recorded.

One of the most touching incidents in these Leaves occurred in 1854, in the Kirk service at Balmoral. "Mr. McLeod," the Journal says, "showed in the sermon how we *all* tried to please *self*, and live for *that*, and in so doing found no rest. Christ had come not only to die for us, but to show how we were to live. The second prayer was very touching; his allusions to us were so simple, saying, after his mention of us, 'bless their children;' it gave me a lump in my throat, as also when he prayed for 'the dying, the wounded, the widow, and the orphans.' Every one came back delighted; and how satisfactory it is to come back from church with such feelings!" Few persons can read these simple words without a sympathetic "lump in the throat." Very human are queens and princes, but doubly to be honored when piety and love are among their most resplendent qualities.

D. A. W.

---

*Military History of U. S. Grant from April, 1861, to April, 1865.* By ADAM BADEAU, Colonel and Aide-de-camp to the General-in-chief, Brevet Brigadier-General United States Army. Vol. I. 8vo., pp. 683. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1868.

As Mr. Badeau has for some years been a member of General Grant's personal staff, and has had full access to General Grant's



private correspondence and personal converse, it must be considered, although its opinions have never been submitted to General Grant, as essentially official. The author has had the free use of the archives of the State Department, and has consulted the originals of all the reports of the rebel generals of every battle described except two. It claims, therefore, to be the most authentic and unquestionable *history* of the entire ground it covers. It is written in a calm, historic tone, and does candid justice to the heroism and talent of the South. The present volume closes at the appointment of General Grant to the command of the national army.

The pages exhibit some leading characters in no favorable light, but the views are sustained at every step by documentary testimony. The western career of Grant, from the capture of Fort Henry until its culmination in the amazing victory at Chattanooga, though detailed without the slightest parade, is intrinsically Napoleonic. He disgraces every general that opposes him. Yet the whole is done with so plain and business-like an air, with such a freedom from fuss and feathers, that all so-called chivalry is doubly worsted: first, by the contrast of style; and, second, by the result of the fighting. It is refreshing in this age of shams to have one eminent specimen of absolutely simple reality.

---

#### *Politics, Law, and General Morals.*

*A Treatise on the Cause of Exhausted Vitality; or Abuse of the Sexual Function.*  
By E. P. MILLER, M. D., Physician to the Hygienic Institute and Turkish Baths,  
13 and 15 Laight-street, New York City. 12mo., pp. 131. New York: John  
A. Gray & Green. 1867.

As the characteristic vice of savagism is cruelty, so the leading vice of over-civilization is voluptuousness. And whenever civilization, unchastened by principle, advances, both vices blend together until, as in the Byzantine empire, so powerfully described by Gibbon, we have the extremes of sensual refinement and of bloody savagism united in absolute perfection. It is becoming fast forced upon the attention of our moral and Christian public that this is the consummation toward which we are fast traveling. Sensational literature of the most abandoned description is overspreading our land. Sensational pictorials display before the public the foulest haunts of murder and debauchery. The tide rises perceptibly and constantly higher and higher, and threatens us with a deluge of licentiousness. And a main difficulty is, that such is the nature of the various forms of sexual vice that delicacy and decency seem to forbid a free and public display of their

nature. The apostle describes the difficulty when he says it is a shame to speak of the things done in secret. And it is wonderful to note that as refined voluptuousness advances this fastidiousness of speech increases. Our holy old book, with a divine purity which the pruriency of our age can hardly understand, calls things by their own names. Dr. Miller, in the volume before us, recommends that ministers boldly preach upon the subject; and we truly believe that the pulpit needs to wake, and deal with it in a judicious but efficient manner. But at any rate the silent page can speak. Our periodicals may utter the truth. And volumes like this of Dr. Miller's may be circulated in the proper places with valuable results.

Dr. Miller's volume is written with much point, faithfulness, and purity of style. Those who have not examined the subject will think he is ultra in some of the principles he enounces. Perhaps he is so. But we think he does not overdraw the darkness of his pictures. His delineation of our present social condition is not exaggerated. And his work is eminently Christian and practical. In particular he gives specific directions how, with proper delicacy, the ignorant victim of the vice designated may be taught its heinousness and deterred from its practice. Externally the book is beautifully executed, and well merits to be put to the uses for which it is wisely and humanely prepared.

---

### *Educational.*

*Mayhew's University Book-keeping.* A Treatise on Business and Accounts. Designed as a Text-book for Commercial Colleges and Seminaries of Learning, for Use in the Counting Room, and for Private Study. By IRA MAYHEW, A.M., Author of "Mayhew's Practical Book-keeping," and "Means and Ends of Universal Education," and for Eight Years Superintendent of Public Instruction in Michigan. 8vo., pp. 318. Boston: Samuel F. Nichols. Chicago: W. B. Keen & Co. 1868.

Mr. Mayhew was for some years superintendent of Public Instruction in the state of Michigan, later principal of the Albion Seminary, and is now proprietor and conductor of a very successful commercial college at Albion. He published some time since a more elementary system of book-keeping, noticed in our *Review*, of which sixty editions were sold in ten years. The present volume is calculated to finish the pupil in all the knowledge preparatory to commercial practice. It begins with the simplest elements, and leads the learner, in the spirit of a genial teacher, yet with complete practical thoroughness, into all the branches of our complex business life. For transparent clearness of development and

illustration it probably has no rival; a fact which eminently fits it not only for the highest institutions of commercial instruction, but for the use of the teacher who has himself never been taught, or for the pupil without a teacher.

---

*Belles-Lettres, Classical, and Philological.*

*Kathrina: Her Life and Mine. In a Poem.* By J. G. HOLLAND, Author of "Bitter-Sweet." 12mo., pp. 287. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

The issue of the "twenty-seventh thousand" of Dr. Holland's new poem attests the great popularity of the author with our countrymen, and whether it was won by "Timothy Titcomb" or the poet is immaterial. He has spoken to the heart of the people with a clear discernment of their character, and in a lively, sensible style. If greatness consists in such a use of the abilities given us as widely and beneficially influences human life, Dr. Holland must be pronounced a great man, even though the abilities may not be of the highest order. Judged by critical tests, "Kathrina" cannot rank with the great poems of the age. It contains brilliant passages, and not a few dull ones; some glowing conceptions, and some that are exceedingly hard and prosaic. The poetic stream flows, like his own Connecticut, unevenly; with smoothness and depth through beautiful fields, and again with difficulty, and as if forcing its way. Its homely character and its simple lessons constitute its great charm. The purpose of the author sanctifies his work. He has a reverence, almost an idolatry, for woman; and he would place before us his ideal of the noblest form of earthly life, "half human, half divine," a perfect Christian woman. Such is "Kathrina," beautiful in form, more beautiful in soul. The native graces of her character, trained and polished by education, are more highly refined by religion. The story tells us how she won her poet husband, first, to work, and then from his worldliness of motive to a pure religious faith, and a working for the sake of duty and usefulness. But it is only in her dying hour that he first kneels and prays. The domestic life portrayed touches the heart with its natural simplicity. The description of it is perfectly commonplace, and for that very reason, may prove refining to many homes. Dr. Holland will, we doubt not, be far better satisfied with such a result of his labor, namely, the infusion of a pure religious element into our home-life through the influence of the Christian wife who presides over it, than with any measure of fame which professional critics might award him for a work of another character. D. A. W.

## Miscellaneous.

- Life of Oliver Cromwell.* By CHARLES ADAMS, D.D. With four illustrations. 16mo., pp. 268. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1868.
- A Catechism of the Ancient Schools, Religious and Moral;* with Parallel References taken from Holy Scripture. Compiled by HOBART BERRIAN. 16mo., pp. 96. New York: John P. Prall. 1867.
- A Suggestive Commentary on the New Testament: St. Luke.* By Rev. W. H. VAN DOREN. 2 vols. 12mo. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1868.
- The Turk and the Greek;* or, Creeds, Races, Society, and Scenery in Turkey, Greece, and the Isles of Greece. By S. J. W. BENJAMIN. 12mo., pp. 268. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867.
- Life among the Mormons, and A March to their Zion.* To which is added a Chapter on the Indians of the Plains and Mountains of the West. By an Officer of the U. S. Army. 12mo., pp. 219. New York: Moorhead, Simpson, & Bond. 1868.
- Two Thousand Miles on Horseback.* Santa Fé and back. A Summer Tour through Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, and New Mexico, in the year 1866. By JAMES F. MELINE. 12mo., pp. 317. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867.
- Italian Journeys.* By W. D. HOWELLS, author of "Venetian Life." 12mo., pp. 320. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867.
- The Elements of Physiology and Hygiene;* a Text-book for Educational Institutions. By THOS. H. HUXLEY, LL.D., F.R.S.; and WM. JAY YOUNG, M.D. 12mo., pp. 420. New York: Appleton & Co. 1868.
- History of the United Netherlands.* From the Death of William the Silent to the Twelve Years' Truce, 1609. By JNO. LATHROP MOTLEY, D.C.L. In four vols., 8vo. Vols. 3 and 4. Pp. 599 and 632. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1868.
- The Clifford Household.* By J. F. MOORE. 16mo., pp. 308. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1868.
- Golden Truths.* Square 12mo., pp. 243. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1868.
- A Manual of the Art of Prose Composition,* for the Use of Colleges and Schools. By J. M. BONNELL, D.D., President of the Wesleyan Female College, Macon, Ga. 12mo., pp. 357. Louisville, Ky.: J. P. Morton & Co. 1867.
- The Duty and the Discipline of Extempore Preaching.* By F. BARHAM ZINCKE, Vicar of Wherstead, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. 12mo., pp. 262. New York: C. Scribner & Co. 1867.
- A Smaller History of England,* from the Earliest Times to the Year 1862. Edited by WM. SMITH, LL.D. 16mo., pp. 357. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1868.
- A French Family.* By MADAME DE WITT, née Guizot. Translated by DINAH MULOCH CRAIK, Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman," etc., etc. 12mo., pp. 216. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1868.
- Stories of the Gorilla Country.* Narrated for Young People. By PAUL DU CHAILLU, Author of "Discoveries in Equatorial Africa," etc. With numerous Illustrations. 12mo., pp. 292. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1868.
- American Notes for General Circulation.* By CHAS. DICKENS. 16mo., pp. 104. (Paper.) New York: Appleton & Co. 1868.
- Oratory, Sacred and Secular;* or, The Extemporaneous Speaker. With Sketches of the most Eminent Speakers of all Ages. By WM. PITTINGER. With an Introduction by Hon. JNO. A. BINGHAM; and an Appendix, containing "a Chairman's Guide" for conducting Public Meetings, according to the best Parliamentary Models. 12mo., pp. 220. New York: S. R. Wells. 1868.
- A Parting Word.* By NEWMAN HALL, LL.D. 16mo., pp. 88. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1868.
- The Little Fox;* or, A Story of Capt. Sir F. L. M'CLINTOCK'S Arctic Expedition. Written for the Young. By S. T. C. Square 16mo., pp. 198. New York: M. W. Dodd. 1867.

Notice of *Bacon's Essays*, from Lee & Shepard, Boston, postponed for want of room.